Class 280.31K Book D65B
General Theological Seminary Library
CHELSEA SQUARE, NEW YORK
Cop. 2

280.31K
D658

A BRIEF EXAMINATION

OF THE PROOFS,

BY WHICH THE REV. MR. BOARDMAN ATTEMPTS TO SUSTAIN HIS CHARGE, THAT

"A LARGE AND LEARNED BODY OF THE CLERGY OF THE CHURCH" (OF ENGLAND) "HAVE RETURNED TO SOME OF THE WORST ERRORS OF POPERY;"

WITH

A WORD OR TWO,

AS TO HIS ATTEMPT, WITHOUT PROOF,

TO CAST THE SUSPICION OF POPERY

ON THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

BY THE RIGHT REV. GEORGE W. DOANE, D.D., LL.D.,

BISHOP OF NEW JERSEY.

GEN. THEOL. SEM. OF THE P. E. CH.

BURLINGTON:
J. L. POWELL, PRINTER.
M DCCC XLI.

280.31 K
D658
97836
Cop. 2

This calumny [*of Popery*] hath been thrown upon the greatest lights of our Church;———————and will be the fate of many more, who shall zealously contend for the primitive doctrines and discipline of Christianity.———————But yet, in the day of any trial, the men of this character will be found the best defenders of the Church of England, and the boldest champions against the corruptions of the Church of Rome.—*Nelson's Life of Bishop Bull, Burton's edition*, p. 311.

Our Reformation was called Popish by Geneva; our Church, Popish by Calvin and Beza, and the Puritans in our own country. Popery, was the charge against all the Bishops in the reign of Elizabeth, of Charles I., and of James II. It has ever been the cry of both parties against the greatest and best of our divines, as often as they have stood forward to maintain against Romanism on one hand, and Puritanism on the other, the rights, ceremonies, or doctrines of the Catholic Church of England. It was the cry against Jewell, Whitgift, Hooker, Bramhall, Andrews, Hall, Laud, Montague, Cosin, Wren, Taylor, Sherlock, Sancroft, Kettlewell, Hickes, Brett, Dodwell, Leslie, Ken, and Butler. Even Chillingworth did not escape the insinuation. And last, though not the least surprising, Baxter himself, "as the reward of all his labours from the separating Independent," was charged "with having done more to strengthen Popery than ever was done by any Papist."—*London Quarterly Review*, 126.

BRIEF EXAMINATION.

THE CHARGE.

These facts are sufficiently startling, but there is another feature in the present religious state of Great Britain, equally ominous, namely, *The Oxford Tract Movement.* Romanism could make little headway in that country, if the ministry of the established Church were all such men as Bickersteth, and Melville, and Henry Blunt, and the Noels. But unhappily, A LARGE AND LEARNED BODY OF THE CLERGY, (embracing the leading ecclesiastical teachers at the ancient University of Oxford,) HAVE RETURNED TO SOME OF THE WORST ERRORS OF POPERY; and are employing both the pulpit and the press, with prodigious efficiency, to give them currency among the people.

This state of things in England must operate powerfully upon this country. The increase of Romanism there, can hardly fail of giving a fresh impulse to it here. The Oxford Tract leaven is already beginning to work in our cities; and ROMAN PRIESTS ARE PUBLICLY FELICITATING THEIR PEOPLE ON THE PROGRESS THEIR DOCTRINES ARE MAKING IN THE BOSOM OF A PROTESTANT CHURCH. —*The Rev. Mr. Boardman's Lecture, pp.* 20, 21.

THE CALL FOR PROOF.

I call upon you distinctly, and by name, for your proofs, that "*a large and learned body of the Clergy*" *of the Church of Eng-*

land, ("embracing the leading ecclesiastical teachers at the ancient University of Oxford,) have returned to some of the worst errors of Popery, and are employing both the pulpit and the press with prodigious efficiency, to give them currency among the people."

Your reference to the state of things in this country is more guarded. By "the Oxford Tract leaven," however, I must suppose you to mean, from the connection in which you use it, the adoption of "some of the worst errors of Popery:" more especially as you state that the "Roman Priests are publicly felicitating their people on the progress their doctrines are making in the bosom of a Protestant Church;" by which you mean, doubtless, the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America. Adopting this interpretation of your language, I call on you distinctly, and by name, for your proofs of *the adoption of "some of the worst errors of Popery" into "the bosom" of that Church; and of the progress in it of any "doctrines," which, in your judgment, would justly authorise the "Roman Priests," as such, in really, as well as "publicly, felicitating their people.*" I say, *really;* for I am sure you are not ignorant of the devices of Popery; how she adapts herself to times and circumstances, taking cameleon-like the hue of every hour, yet all the while in purpose and intent unchanging and unchangeable; how skilful and how prompt she is in that old trick of tyrants, to divide and conquer; nay, how she has put on the very face and garb of Puritanism,[1] that she might undermine what she

---

[1] See a note to a very able article, "Romanism in Ireland," written, without a doubt, at Oxford, in the London Quarterly Review, No. cxxxiii. The statement there made, that Romish priests did go to England in 1566, and thereabouts, disguised as Presbyterians, Independents, and Anabaptists, by order from Rome; and did teach the people, in these assumed characters, as Faithful Commin—one of the most active of them—confessed, to hate the liturgy, to pray extempore, to despise ceremonies, to profess tender consciences, and to call a set form of words, "the mass translated," is familiar to all well informed Church-

most dreads and hates, the Church of England, and the truth as held by her.

In thus addressing you, I undertake no championship of what you are pleased to call "the Oxford Tract movement," as such; claiming, however, for myself the privilege to use, and to approve, without permission, and without reproach, (responsible for that alone which I adopt,) the vast amount that is most timely, and most excellent, in those calumniated writings. As little do I identify myself with any school or set of men, on either side of the Atlantic: although the names of those whom you have charged as striving to pervert their age to Popery, while they profess to stand upon the ground which Cranmer held at his life's cost—the ground of primitive antiquity—are such, for talents, learning, piety, integrity, holiness, heavenly-mindedness, charity, as would adorn the purest age the Church has ever known; and are—the Papists know it, though you do not—the boldest and the ablest living champions of the truth, against the force and fraud of fallen, frenzied Rome. I do no more than claim the application of that golden rule of mutual duty, which the Saviour has taught us, in demanding, as I would that others should for me, revisal of the sentence, which, without a proper hearing, has been passed upon the innocent and absent. Nay, less; far less than this. I do but act on the indignant prompting of a heathen's sense of justice:

"———————— absentem qui rodit amicum;
Qui non defendit, alio culpante;————————
———————— hic niger est, hunc tu, Romane, caveto."

Letter to the Rev. Mr. Boardman, Banner of the Cross, for 20th Feb. 1841.

---

men. A sufficient reference, for the present, is to Strype's Life of Archbishop Parker, vol. i. pp. 141, 459, 484; Clarendon Press edition, 1821. [It appears that the conjecture above, as to the source of this article, is probably correct. The Rev. Professor Sewell, of Oxford, is visited, as its author, with the most violent abuse, in the Popish Journals, on both sides of the Atlantic.]

Before stated, will be found the distinct CHARGE, that they "have returned to some of the worst errors of Popery," publicly brought, in his own pulpit, and deliberately repeated, under his own name, through the press, by the "Pastor" of a "Presbyterian Church," against "a large and learned body of the Clergy" of the Church of England; and the same charge more than insinuated as involving—how far, it is not said, but "the bosom" is the central seat from which corruption spreads with fiercest and most fatal violence—we are left to suppose, therefore, deeply involving, the Protestant Episcopal Church in these United States. There will be found, also, the CALL FOR PROOF, publicly made, quite as distinct,[1] and under a responsible name, that this grave charge is just, this more than insinuation authorized by facts. In due time, a pamphlet issued from the press of Hooker and Agnew, purporting to be "Correspondence [?] between the Right Rev. Bishop Doane, of New Jersey, and the Rev. H. A. Boardman, of Philadelphia, on the alleged Popish character of the 'Oxford Divinity.'" It is to that portion of the "Correspondence" which is headed "Reply," that attention is now invited, while it undergoes a BRIEF EXAMINATION. Let it be distinctly understood, as stated in the Call for Proof, the present writer is moved by no desire for controversy, no chivalry of

---

[1] *Personal* and *peremptory* are the epithets applied to it, by the Rev. Mr. Boardman, in his "Card;" and very justly. It was a *personal* call for evidence, in a case of deepest import to the truth, and meant to be *most peremptory*.

championship, to that for which he has as little taste as time. His only motive is the sense of simple justice. Though not indifferent to the attempt to cast suspicion on the Church in which he ministers, the strongest impulses of his nature have been roused, by the unwarranted assault upon the Clergy of the sister Church. It was to that portion of his Charge, that the accuser's attention was chiefly called. The honest hope was entertained, that ground, which is untenable, would candidly be yielded to the just convictions of a new investigation.[1] It is not so. The hot haste of an inconsiderate accusation has been kept alive, through a *"sober and deliberate" re-examination of less than two working days;* and an attempt to prove what, not being true, can never be proved, has been preferred to the fair opportunity for generous acknowledgment of error. It remains only to show, by brief examination, what kind of proof the Call for Proof has brought—how much the Charge has gained

---

[1] How little ground there really was for such a "hope" may be learned from a comparison of dates. The Call for Proof appeared in the "Banner of the Cross," published on Saturday, February 20; and yet the first letter of the "Reply," dated, Monday, February 22, contains these expressions—"I beg leave to assure you, Reverend Sir, that you are mistaken, in supposing that the above passage was penned 'without due consideration.' *It was written* (and written not in anger, but in sorrow,) *after mature reflection.* Nevertheless, the possibility that I might have wronged the authors of those publications, (a wrong I should be as prompt to atone for, when discovered, as any friend of theirs could be to demand 'reparation,') has induced me, *on your suggestion, to re-consider the whole subject, and re-investigate the grounds* on which the statements were made. *I have examined the Oxford publications anew,* (as many of them, that is, as are within my reach,) and I am only strengthened in the opinions on which you have animadverted. It is my *sober, deliberate judgment,* &c."—How much value is to be attached to the "sober, deliberate judgment" of a *re-consideration* and *re-investigation,* accomplished in less

in strength by the *re-consideration* of the whole subject, and *re-investigation* of the grounds on which it was advanced.

And, first, before the proofs themselves are taken up, *a manifest design to change the issue* must be noticed.[1] The "Lecture" charges that "a large and learned body of the Clergy" of the Church of England, ("embracing the leading ecclesiastical teachers at the ancient University of Oxford,) have returned to some of the worst errors of Popery." The "Correspondence," substituting for the allowed axiom,

---

than *three* days, *one of which was the Lord's day*, will be better understood, when it is stated, that while the "Tracts for the Times" themselves make five octavo volumes, amounting, in a small type, closely printed, to more than three thousand pages; there are not less than twelve octavo volumes more, (to enumerate merely Dr. Pusey's, Mr. Newman's, and Mr. Keble's writings,) which go to make "the Oxford Publications," in the strictest sense—the whole number printed or reprinted, within the last ten years, under the same auspices, and liable, in a greater or less degree, to the same condemnation, falling scarcely short of fifty 8vo. volumes. A steam power, truly, of "mature reflection," and of "sober and deliberate judgment"! There is, it is true, the saving clause, "as many of them, that is, as are within my reach." But when the reputation of "a large and learned body of the Clergy" of the Church of England, not to speak of the poor souls on this side of the Atlantic, was at stake, the "reach" should surely have been stretched to the very utmost, before the Charge, so solemnly called in question, was re-asserted. The simple truth is, as will hereafter be made apparent—I here assert it, and challenge the denial—the Rev. Mr. Boardman, when he put the "Correspondence" to the press, HAD NOT READ THE OXFORD PUBLICATIONS which he charged as Popish. Had such a state of things been dreamed of as a possibility, the expectation which the Call for Proof expressed would not have been entertained. But the "charity" which "hopeth all things" must lay its account in frequent disappointment.

[1] This is apparent, whoever may be answerable for that, even in the advertisement; which, in some of the papers, at least was headed, "Doane vs. Boardman." The true record of the case would be, *The Commonwealth vs. Boardman, in an action for a libel*, on "a large and learned body of the Clergy" &c.

the greater includes the less, the assumption that the whole is comprehended in the part, undertakes the discussion of "the Oxford Divinity;" and leaves its readers to find, where they may, "the large and learned body of the Clergy," compared with whom, at the first going off, "the leading ecclesiastical teachers, at the ancient University of Oxford," were but a parenthesis. Let us allow, however, for good neighborhood, that the previous allusion to that "ominous" "feature in the present religious state of Great Britain," "the Oxford Tract movement," might possibly excuse the narrowing, on second thoughts, of ground so wide at first—though, in an action for a libel, such a plea could scarcely hold—and still, there is *an attempted change of issue.* The "Lecture" charges, that "a large and learned body of the Clergy, embracing" as before, "*have returned* to some of the worst errors of Popery." The "Correspondence" contents itself with undertaking to set forth "*the alleged Popish character* of 'the Oxford Divinity:'" and the strong expression of the "Lecture," "*have returned to,*" scarcely appearing in the "Correspondence," is carefully diluted into terms like these—"*embody* 'some of the worst errors of Popery;'" "'some of the worst errors of Popery' *incorporated with* that system;" "the main question between us respects *the alleged Popish character* (*in some particulars*) of the Oxford publications."

It is not so. "The main question" is *not* "the alleged Popish character of the Oxford publications;" much less is it their "Popish character, *in some particulars.*" What says the Call for Proof? "I

call upon, you distinctly and by name, for your proofs, that *'a large and learned body of the Clergy of the Church' of England* '(embracing the leading ecclesiastical teachers of the ancient University of Oxford) *have returned to some of the worst errors of Popery*, and are employing both the pulpit and the press with prodigious efficiency to give them currency among the people.' "—"In thus addressing you I undertake no championship of what you are pleased to call 'the Oxford Tract movement,' as such; claiming, however, for myself the privilege to use and to approve, without permission and without reproach, (responsible for that alone which I adopt,) the vast amount that is most timely and most excellent in those calumniated writings. As little do I identify myself with any school or set of men, on either side of the Atlantic." Is it an answer to this Call for Proof, to undertake a mere discussion of "the Oxford publications," however full and fair? Is it defence sufficient, from the charge of unjust judgment of "a large and learned body of the Clergy," as having "returned to some of the worst errors of Popery," to show, even if it could be done, the "Popish character" of publications," by a part of them? Much less, their "Popish character, *in some particulars*?" This is a serious matter. There is no temporal good to be compared in worth with reputation. The reputation of the Clergy is the treasure of the Church. The charge upon "a large and learned body" of them—the epithet of "learned" precludes the explanation of their being mistaken—that they are diligently seeking, by the pulpit and the press, to give curren-

cy to errors, which they are bound by the most solemn vows that man can utter and that God can hear, "with all faithful diligence to banish and drive away," involves, if it be true, the utmost reach of treachery and blasphemy. Nay, it is uttered now—uttered in public as a part of pastoral teaching, and then deliberately published through the press—when the whole air is teeming with suspicion; and to be named in the same breath with "Popery," is to bear a brand upon the brow for life! Is it to be permitted,[1] that at such a time, and upon such a subject, grave men, who write themselves as pastors, shall play at fast and loose, with words, that "eat, as doth a canker?" Shall it be tolerated, that "a large and learned body of the Clergy" of a Church protesting against Roman error, shall be accused of having "*returned to*" Popery; and, when the proof is called for, find that three, or four, or five, are meant? Are the most sweeping censures to be passed, and in the strongest terms; and then, shall the "accuser of the brethren" be permitted to circumscribe the range, and mitigate the

---

[1] There are no symptoms of such allowance to be detected in the "Correspondence." For instance, pains are taken to state, at the beginning of the first Letter, that the writer is "indebted to the courtesy of a friend," for a copy of the "Banner of the Cross," which contained the Call for Proof; when he well knew, from the Editor of "the Banner," that particular directions were given, when the Call for Proof was sent, that the paper containing it should be sent to him, as soon as it was printed. He might have known, moreover, that, at the same time, directions were given—lest reply should seem to be expected upon ground which might not be thought perfectly impartial—that insertion should be solicited for the Call for Proof in some of the daily papers, of the city; which insertion was respectfully declined, at several offices, on the ground of avoiding a theological controversy.

terms of the indictment, at his pleasure? Shall men be charged with outright crimes, and then be tried for "character?"[1] Accused of murder, and then hanged for tendencies?[2] There is a confession of weakness, not to dwell upon its rank injustice, in the very start of this defence, which must strike every one that reads with both eyes open; and which throws distrust—unhappily, in the present instance, but too well founded—on all which follows after.

Scarcely less surprising than the design to narrow down the ground first taken with so bold an air, and so to change the issue, is the attempt—disclaimed, indeed, on the last page,[3] but never properly employed—to find protection in the plea, that *the "imputation,"* which the "Lecture" involves, "against the character of the Oxford Divinity," *is not "a novelty," but claims the shelter of distinguished names.* It will be, as it is sincerely meant to be, no disrespect to any of these, to ask, how many several assertions go to make one proof? Upon an action for a libel, in a civil court, would it be received at all, even in mitigation of damages, that the same, or like calumnious words, had been alleged by others? Suppose the "Pastor" of some "Presbyterian Church"—the case has been, and it may be again—should come, under suspicion of erroneous teaching, with his brethren, and be

---

[1] So the title of the "Correspondence"—"the *alleged* Popish *character* of the Oxford Divinity."

[2] "A strong Popish *tendency*," p 21. "Another indication of the Popish *tendency* of this system," p 71.

[3] "I fully recognize your right to make the requisition with which I have been honoured." p. 100.

brought up for trial. Who would think of resting the prosecution on the ground, that the same charge had been brought against him, from a dozen, or a hundred, sources? What would be taken, as the proof of error, but the words which he himself had uttered; and they, not tried by the opinion of this Pastor, or that Editor, but by the only rule of faith? And is it less an evil, to be publicly arraigned, before the world, for "Popery," and that with treachery and blasphemy involved, than to be summoned before any possible tribunal, that admits the forms of law, and owns the duty to do justice? Is public defamation to be warranted by grounds, which would sustain no prosecutor, before any tribunal, short of the Papal Inquisition? Is it upon what this one is "constrained to say," and that one is "constrained to think;" because "they seem" to one author, and another can "come to no other conclusion;" that "a large and learned body of the Clergy" of the Church of England, and an undefined proportion of the Clergy of the sister Church, on this side of the Atlantic, are to be branded as foul recreants, and cast beyond the pale of charity, and divested of the very hope of influence with their brethren, or even of access to them, as if the leper spot were on their skin? And, suppose a case conceivable, in which such things might be, is this asserted to be such? Can it be possible, that they who "are employing both the pulpit and the press, with" such "prodigious efficiency, to give" "some of the worst errors of Popery" "currency among the people," cannot be proved what they are charged with being, from their own words—

must be condemned by hearsay and opinion,[1] by the judgment of anonymous newspaper writers, or even of a periodical of "singular consistency?"[2] It cannot be that any such proceeding will be sanctioned for a moment. The plea of shelter or authority, from others who have made the charge before, will be rejected promptly, both by common justice, and by common sense. The author of the Lecture was under no necessity to bring the charge. In doing so, he makes himself responsible. By the merits, he must stand or fall; not by the weight, if weight there be, of names. "No matter by whom," says the Editor of the National Gazette, "or when, a wrong may be done, the repetition of it, by other persons, and at other times, is not the less a wrong. This proposition needs no elucidation."

But we are not yet ready for the "proof." *The Romanists*, forsooth, *approve the doctrine, and commend the teachers.* With what good reason, shall be seen hereafter. Meanwhile, let leave be had, to ask, if Richard Hooker should be given over as a Papist, because Dr. Wiseman calls him "that best of Protestant divines?" If Faithful Commin[3] ceased to be a Pa-

---

[1] Let the reader take notice how very little Mr. Boardman relies on passages from the Oxford writings themselves, as noted by himself. How very much on the opinions or quotations of those who have condemned them.

[2] The fifteenth volume of the Christian Observer, the periodical here alluded to—would that its later volumes *were* consistent with its former!—contains an exposition and defence of Bishop Jebb's admirable "Appendix" on the rule of faith, as held and taught by the Church of England, which, as one has well observed, might readily be adopted at Oxford, as a "Tract for the Times." See pp. 358—365.

[3] See Archbishop Parker's Life, by Strype, vol. i, pp. 141, 459, 484.

pist, because he looked the Presbyterian, and prayed *extempore*, and called the Liturgy, the Mass? If any trick, in short, can overpass their capacity for fraud, who hold, and teach, that simulation is a lawful thing?[1] Let it be asked, still farther, if the praise of Papists[2] be conclusive proof of Popery, what the conclusion must be from their most merciless invective. As when, from the suggestion, in the Call for Proof, that Popery must not be always taken for its face, the "Catholic Herald" (so miscalled,) can find no word too strong to stigmatize the author; until, finally, the

---

[1] Cited by Mr. Southey, in his Vindiciæ Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ, from the Decretals, p. 285, Paris edition of 1518—"Simulatio utilis est, et in tempore assumenda."

[2] Not *the Catholics;* that is false. Not *the Roman Catholics;* that is self-contradictory and absurd. Not *the Romanists;* that does not describe the case. St. Paul addressed an epistle to the Romans, or Romanists; that is, Churchmen at Rome. We might as well call our friends at Oxford and Cambridge, Anglicans; and they us, Americans: which would mean just next to nothing. But *the Papists;* because that expresses their distinctive character. Why should *Papist* be more offensive to them, than *Protestant Episcopalian* to us? It would not, if they did not see—what so many who, by birthright, are true Catholics, (*which they are not*) will not see—that it stands directly in the way of their false claim, to be *the* Church Catholic. We need not be discourteous. That, the truth never requires. But "things by their right names," is no discourtesy. With Martin Luther, we may call "a spade, a spade." "I offer no apology whatever," says Mr. Palmer, "for the use of a term which I *designedly* employ, for the purpose of marking the sectarian and schismatical character of the community alluded to. Truth, should never be sacrificed to a hollow and contemptible courtesy." They seem to have forgotten that Cardinal Hosius taught that they should glory in the name. "Si quis nos hac de causa Papistas appellare vellet, non solum nihil nos ejus appellationis puderet; verumetiam cum primis id amplum nobis ad laudem et gloriam esse judicaremus." And again, "Tu vero, si quis te Papistam vocaverit, non modo moleste ne feras, verum te magno potius affectum honore interpretatus, age gratias," vol. i. pp. 669, 735—cited by Mr. Palmer. And this is sound and just. If the Pope be what they claim, there can be no name, after Christian, so honourable; as none so truly descriptive.

climax is attained—"compared with the conduct of Bishop Doane, we must confess, that the proceedings of such people as Boardman and Sparry appear to us excusable!"[1] The sum and substance of all which may be well stated in the temperate words of Mr. Palmer, in his most triumphant vindication of "the Apostolical jurisdiction and succession of the Episcopacy in the British Churches," "against the objections of Dr. Wiseman, in the Dublin Review." "Dr. Wiseman has devoted his attention to the theologians of Oxford in general, and especially to the 'Tracts for the Times;' and *has endeavoured to make their principles and conclusions available for his own purposes.* He felt that their general tendency was not (as some have imagined) to establish the dominion, and the superstitions, of Rome, but to purify and invigorate the Church of England, and to edify the whole Catholic Church; and *he has attempted,* in this series of papers, *to excite prejudice* against sound and salutary principles, by fixing on them a character alien from the intention of their advocates, in ancient or modern times. The learned and religious authors of the 'Tracts for the Times,' need no advocacy but their own: in the articles, however, which form the subject of the following pages, *they are made the medium of so direct an attack upon the Church of England in general,* that I trust I may

[1] The rabid rage with which this paper has assailed the present writer, finds no fit resemblance short of a mad dog. The smoke of Smithfield may be smelled in every line. But it is all well. One cannot greatly be in wrong, when so between the fires of errors, that profess to be antagonist. The "Via Media," even Ovid knew, was safest—"Medio tutissimus ibis."

stand excused for interfering in a matter with which they are so immediately concerned." The statement, in the latter part of the last sentence, applies quite as well to attacks, from other hands than those of Rome, so far as purpose and intent can go.

We have thus disposed of the first Letter of the three, which make up the "Reply;" and, with it, of the perfectly extraneous matter by which the attempt to prove the Charge has been encumbered. It is a fitting place to state, what is, and what is not, proposed in this Examination—the more so, from the rambling and discursive way in which the Proofs are brought And first, it is not meant to undertake the exposition, and much less the defence, of what it is the fashion of the times to call, though most improperly, "The Tract System," and "the Oxford divinity."[1] And this, not so much because, as Mr. Palmer says "the learned and religious authors of the 'Tracts for the Times' need no advocacy but their own;" as because there is in truth, no system, or attempt at any system, much less the setting up of any standard in divinity: but, as Dr. Pusey well expresses it, "tracts, written for a temporary purpose, by persons unknown, or those who were known, but little known beyond their own University," and yet, "within a few years," "made, *against the will of their writers*, into a sort of touchstone of opinion, almost throughout the land." The present writer's

[1] When one spoke, in what was meant, doubtless, for contempt, of "the New Divinity," it was impossible not to be reminded of the complaint of some of the friars, at the revival of learning, which preceded the Reformation, that some had invented *a new language, which they called Greek!*

views cannot be better stated, than in the following extract from Professor Sewell's Letter, to the Editor of the Irish Ecclesiastical Journal.

"You have invited me to an amicable discussion of the doctrines contained in Dr. Pusey's letter, and in the Tracts for the Times. My language, I fear, must have been indistinct, if it failed to explain that such an undertaking would be a direct compromise of the very principle for which I was contending. Clergymen in England, who advocate what are called Church principles, on the authority of the formularies and standard divines of their Church, and who approve generally of the Tracts for the Times, on account of their general accordance with the same standards, could scarcely permit themselves to be drawn into a defence of the Tracts, in place of simply maintaining their own principles, without much mischief following. It would necessarily lead others to suppose that there were disciples or followers of the Tracts, who wished others to recognize them as authoritative. And when a theological controversy has once been allowed to slide from general truths, into the merits of peculiar writers, especially of a collective body, however small, it must sink into party spirit, and forgetfulness of the true authority appointed for the decision of theological questions; perhaps into personality and acrimony. The history of past controversies in the Church may surely warn us against mixing up the names of individuals with the discussion of doctrines.

"As Churchmen, we are comparatively little concerned with the opinions of Dr. Pusey or Mr. Newman. Those who think them erroneous are bound to point out their errors in the spirit of Christian love; and the authors must undertake their own defence. But a bystander, no way connected with their teaching, is not called on to come forward in its behalf; he may not accurately understand the opinions themselves, nor the precise grounds for them in the minds of the authors; and he does as much as is either necessary or safe, when he delivers his own humble testimony to the general character of the writers attacked. This I have never hesitated to do. And, loaded as the authors in question have been, with the most unmerited obloquy, I should be ashamed not to express my conviction, that if they

have erred in minor points, they have revived, under God's blessing, most important and essential truths; that the tenor of their teaching is, like their lives, humble, holy, and consistent with the Word of God, and the spirit of Christians;[1] and that no men have lived, since the seventeenth century, who have contributed more than they have to the Church of England, and to the diffusion of the truths of the Gospel. This may be perfectly compatible with the occurrence of indistinct or inaccurate statements; even with a tendency to one extreme of opinion, while they are retreating from another. But it is the part of Christians to judge men by their general efforts and intentions, not by incidental aberrations. Those who dislike the whole tendency of their writings, who object to the recognition of any authority in the Church, to any divine title for the appointment of its ministers, to any deep and awful views of the sacraments, any recall of men's minds from a luxurious, self-indulgent, licentious spirit,

---

[1] It is a pity and a shame that Mr. Boardman should have forgotten himself so far as to impugn the private characters of the Oxford writers. *He* should not have been the man to write down Aristides for the ostracism, because he tired of hearing him called *the just*. So far as I have observed, there has been no one before him, who has attacked their character, as Christians. The common course has been, to admit their excellence, and say, "So much the worse: it is always so with heretics!" Which does not happen to be true. And then, to cast suspicion on them, on a mere *petitio principii!* To assume them Papists in disguise, and then conclude against their honesty or heavenly-mindedness! "And I believe some charitably disposed persons," says Mr. Boardman, "have found no small difficulty in conceiving how men of such exalted 'integrity' 'and holiness" could suffer their subscription to the Thirty Nine Articles to stand uncancelled, while they are publishing such sentiments as those advocated in the Tracts." A truly Rhadamanthine judgment—"castigat, auditque!"

The following testimony of the London Times, in March, comes to hand while this is in press. "No man, however widely differing from them, can open any of their publications, without perceiving that they write with learning, ability, calmness, seriousness, command of temper, a strong sense of responsibility, forbearance, and courtesy of language towards their adversaries. No man can know anything of their lives, without being aware that they act consistently with their professions: that they are more than usually strict, circumspect, self denying, and (as far as man can judge by outward demeanour) pious. The most respectable of their opponents in controversy, especialy the Master of the Temple, and the present Bishop of Chichester, have borne free and generous

to self-denial, obedience, and discipline, will, of course, condemn them as a mass of errors. But those who believe and value the fundamental principles of their teaching, will guard carefully against a general censure, even when lamenting or opposing particular faults. They will speak, as men engaged in the same good cause, kindly, respectfully—as admonishing rather than condemning—never finding fault without acknowledging excellencies; and guarding, as much as possible, against permitting their own exceptions to be confounded with a popular clamor. This is the spirit in which we ought to speak of the Tracts for the Times, and none is more likely to promote the real interests of truth."

There cannot be a better illustration of the true claims and character of the Tracts for the Times, than is furnished by the well known essays, called, collectively, "The Federalist." As these were written,

---

testimony to their merits, in these respects. Such antagonists never, even for a moment, expressed or felt the smallest doubt, that the men with whom they had to deal were sincerely attached to the Church of England, firmly persuaded that their doctrine was identical with hers, and utterly incapable of deliberately violating their oaths. No calumny, we are satisfied, was ever more unmerited than this, which casts upon men who are peculiarly zealous for ecclesiastical authority, (and who are maligned for being so,) the imputation of disregarding it in practice. *They* were not 'Puseyites,' who contended for the abolition of subscription to the 39 Articles in our Universities. *They* were not 'Puseyites,' who, in 1833, made the press teem with pamphlets in favour of changes in the Prayer-book. *They* are not 'Puseyites,' who, having sworn to obey the Rubric, depart from it as often as they think proper in the celebration of Divine service. *They* are not 'Puseyites,' who alter or leave out such expressions as do not suit their notions, in the offices of burial and baptism. But men who do these things, together with the organs of that political party which has abetted all the attacks of dissent upon the Church of England, accuse men who do them not, of unfaithfulness to the Church: and politicians, whose whole official life has been devoted to the advancement of Popery in the United Kingdom, cry out 'No Popery!' with the loudest, if an Oxford clergyman dares to suggest that the Church of Rome, though corrupt, may possibly not be Antichrist; or ventures to breathe a prayer for the restoration of Christian unity throughout the world."

by the patriots of the day, to aid in disseminating just views of the Federal Constitution, and to promote its cordial reception with the people of the United States; so those were undertaken, with a view to rouse the Church to a sense of its true position, and solemn responsibilities; and this, by reviving the contemplation, and the study of her foundation principles, as taught in the first ages, and revived by her Reformers. No one now would charge the authors of the Federalist, as partizans, as system-mongers, as enemies of the country in disguise. No one would hold that Mr. Madison, for instance, was responsible for all the views of General Hamilton, or General Hamilton for none but those of Mr. Jay. No one would take these papers to bind the Constitution, or be the sole expounder of its sense, any more than they themselves laid claim to such a character. No one would hold any person, who in general approved the views, which in those papers were so ably advocated, for every word, which every one of them contains; or claim that all who read them, and, in the main, defend them, are thereby formed into a party, and, as such, to be suspected of more than they profess, or reviled for what they never dreamed of. No greater liberty than this is claimed for Oxford writers, or for Oxford readers. *But this is claimed:* and is a part of that with which Christ has made us free. Against the denial of this simplest right of Christian freemen—its unjust and inconsistent denial, as practised in the present instance—the London Quarterly Review, records a generous protest, with every word of which, all honest readers of the Tracts, however

they may not agree with them, will freely sympathize. "Men are called Papists, who are writing against Popery with infinitely more of learning and of zeal, than perhaps any of their contemporaries; traitors to the Church of England, when their time, talents, and money are devoted to support it; violators of the Rubric, when they are enforcing its authority; theorists and inventors of novelties, in the same page which stigmatizes them as bigots to antiquity and authority; upholders of human tradition, while they are blessing God, that the Church rests on no human names, but on the inspiration of the Apostles; and founders of a party, when their avowed object is to merge all parties in the Catholic Church. And after all, there is no party in existence; since, with the exception of three or four friends,[1] other writers in the same cause, are evidently independent asserters of their own personal views —No. 126, "*Oxford Theology.*"

And, as it is not the present purpose, to defend the writers of the Oxford Tracts, in general; so it is not

---

[1] The account, which Mr. Perceval has very lately furnished, of "The Oxford Movement," in a Letter to the Editor of "The Irish Ecclesiastical Journal," is one of the most interesting pieces of literary history ever given to the world. It is not often that we get so near to the first springs of any great controlling operation; and still less that they are found so perfectly transparent, and like chrystal, in their purity. If there has lived a man in our day, whose name and character could be accepted as the pledge, that whatever he engaged in, was "honest," "just," "pure," "lovely," and "of good report," it was—alas, that it must be written, *the late!*—Hugh James Rose. And yet, it was at his Parsonage, as Mr. Perceval tells us, that the first consultation was held. One would think that this little secret history alone, vouched as it is, by one of the most unquestionable names in England, must quite suffice to do away forever the suspicion of Popery. The Letter will be found in the Appendix.

designed to touch a single one of all the countless charges, not contained in the original indictment: to show, for instance, that the body of these writings is not a "volume of heresy;" (p. 29,) or that they do not "go still farther" than the Papists; (p. 35,) or that they do not teach with the ancient pagans;"[1] (p. 66.) The question is *not* about tendencies towards Popery, nor yet of doctrines *worse than Popery*, but about "some of the worst errors of Popery" itself. Nay, THE QUESTION is *not*, whether the Oxford writers do, or do not, teach "some of the worst errors of Popery"—though, upon this point, every doubt, we trust, will be effectually removed—but, HAS MR. BOARDMAN PROVED THAT THEY DO TEACH THEM? Does he sustain his charge by proof, drawn from the books themselves? He cannot raise the shadow of an objection to this course. Not contented with assuring us, in his first Letter, of the mature "deliberation" of his less than two days' reading; he tells us in his second Letter, in Italics, that he has "*examined them in detail.*" "The quotations from them I had read, had left a deep impression on my mind of their dangerous tendency; but this impression became tenfold stronger, when I came to *explore the system as*

---

[1] The Oxford teaching seems to assume to Mr. Boardman's eye, as many shapes as Hamlet's cloud, and he expects his readers to be as yielding as Polonius.

"*Hamlet.* Do you see yonder cloud, that's almost in shape of a camel?

Polonius. By the mass, and 'tis like a camel, indeed.

Hamlet. Methinks it is like a weazel.

Polonius. It is back'd like a weazel.

Hamlet. Or like a whale,

Polonius. Very like a whale."

a whole."(p. 33.) And yet, for one who had explored the system as a whole, not only, but examined the details, there seem to be some strange misgivings as to its true nature. "The *way* in which Romanism is taught in these writings, (p. 30,)" perplexes him. "Whoever expects to find it openly and systematically inculcated in them, will be disappointed." Doubtless, he will! "Nothing can be more ingenious or subtle than the principle, on which the controversy with Popery is managed." Coquettish controversialists, they seem to be! "Some points of it, as for example," (a large sample!) "the supremacy of the Pontiff, the schismatical position of the Romish Church, in its relation to the 'Anglo Catholic Church,' transubstantiation, &c., they attack manfully: one broadside follows another, until the reader really begins to fancy they are the boldest of all the 'champions' who have entered the lists against that antichristian hierarchy. But on other points," ("&c." should have included all that was not named,) "you will frequently find the case between Rome and Protestant Christendom stated in a way much more favourable to the Papist, than the Protestant: it is not so much asserted as insinuated, that Rome has the best of it." And, let her have the best of it, if she consents to think so, after Oxford broadsides have demolished the supremacy of the Pope, and transubstantiation, (as she holds it, with an anathema on all that do not see it just as she does,) and made her out to be in schism, in her relation to the Anglo Catholic Church! A pretty Popery, indeed, without supremacy and transubstantiation! A very

harmless monster, truly! A Popery without a Pope!

But, as well by what they do *not* say, as what they do, our Lecturer is puzzled "In other passages you feel sure you are approaching, step by step, an explicit avowal of some rank Popish tenet. But just as you fancy[!] you have reached the point, and hasten to the next sentence, to seize on the development, the writer turns off, to indulge in some vague generalities; or to caution you against premature judging in a case, where so venerable a father, as this one or that one, has spoken doubtingly. Again, you are confident, after reading a sentence, that there is Popery in it; but when you return to lay hold of it, it eludes your grasp.[1] 'They are' (to use the language of the London Christian Observer) so 'scholastically constructed, that when the obvious bearing of a passage or tract is shown[?] to be open to objection, there is *some little qualifying word in a corner*, which an ordinary reader would never discover, to ward off the full weight of an honest [?] reply to the passage in its true spirit.' It may be that these 'traps for critics' have not been noticed by my Right Rev. Correspondent; but many persons have an idea that the Tracts abound with them." (p. 31.) No doubt they do; and with "traps" for some who are not "critics." And hence the feeble headway that is made against these "little qualifying words;" and hence these rare confessions of "unsophisticated" Protestants, who find, too late, that they have tried their teeth upon a file.

[1] Most truly graphic this and to the life! Like the complaint of the poor Irishman, "He put his finger on him, but he was not there!"

But to the question just now stated, as the true and proper issue—not as presented in the "Lecture," but as *taken* in the "Reply"—HAS MR. BOARDMAN SUSTAINED, FROM THEIR OWN WRITINGS, HIS CHARGE AGAINST THE OXFORD DIVINES, THAT THEY HAVE "RETURNED TO SOME OF THE WORST ERRORS OF POPERY?" "In the first place, it is important," says Mr. Boardman, "we should define what is to be understood by the phrase, 'some of the *worst errors*' (his own Italics) 'of Popery.'" And such a definition! "There may be a difference of opinion on this point. Some may hold that the Papal Supremacy, the schismatic position of the Church of Rome within the dioceses of the Church of England, the denial of the cup to the laity, &c., &c.[1], are the worst features of Romanism. But the author of the Lecture had his eye upon what *he* deemed to be errors of a much deeper dye. He believes, with the judicious Hooker, that 'the[2] grand question that hangeth in controversy between us and Rome, is about the matter of JUSTIFYING RIGHTEOUSNESS.' With this, may be associated the NATURE AND MEANS OF REGENERATION, and the NATURE AND TRUE DESERT OF SIN. The doctrines of Rome, on these, and their affiliated points, together with her rejection of the Bible, as the only infallible

---

[1] A favourite figure of speech, this seems to be; and used, as here, in some most awkward junctures.

[2] These are not Hooker's exact words, nor do they convey Hooker's sense. What he says is this: "This openeth a way to the understanding of *that* grand question, which hangeth *yet* in controversy between us and the Church of Rome, about the matter of justifying righteousness." No one can doubt the importance of this error, in Hooker's view of the controversy; yet he does not here select it, as "*the* grand question."

Rule of Faith, are, in the judgment of the writer, her 'worst errors'—the prolific source of nearly all her abominations." (p. 20.) Such is the definition, given in the "Reply," small capitals, and all. Now it certainly is rather clumsy, and not very clear. To a reader of the Oxford writings, it seems a meagre inventory. To be sure, one cannot tell how much may be contained in those "affiliated points"—equivalent, perhaps, to "&c. &c."—yet one must think, that an "unsophisticated Protestant," on reading it, might own to some surprise. Very different from this, and much more like the hot blood of the Smithfield sufferers, is the Oxford Tract list of "irreconcilable differences!" It has been furnished to our hands, in a dialogue upon the "Via Media," between a Layman and a Clergyman; and, as it is from the first volume of the Tracts, bearing date 1833–4, may be considered, in the opening sentence, well nigh prophetic.

"Be assured of this—no party will be more opposed to our doctrine, if it ever prospers and makes noise, than the Roman party. This has been proved before now. In the seventeenth century, the theology of the divines of the English Church was substantially the same as ours is; and it experienced the full hostility of the Papacy. It was the true Via Media: Rome sought to block up that way, as fiercely as the Puritans. History tells us this. In a few words, then, before we separate, I will state some of my irreconcileable differences with Rome as she is; and in stating her errors, I will closely follow the order observed by Bishop Hall in his treatise on *The Old Religion*, whose Protestantism is unquestionable.

I consider that it is unscriptural to say with the Church of Rome, that 'we are justified by inherent righteousness.'

That it is unscriptural that 'the good works of a man justified do *truly* merit eternal life.'

That the doctrine of transubstantiation, as not being revealed, but a theory of man's devising, is profane and impious.

That the denial of the cup to the laity, is a bold and unwarranted encroachment on their privileges as Christ's people.

That the sacrifice of masses, as it has been practised in the Roman Church, is without foundation in Scripture or antiquity, and therefore blasphemous and dangerous.

That the honour paid to images is very full of peril, in the case of the uneducated, that is, of the great part of Christians.

That indulgences, as in use, are a gross and monstrous invention of later times.

That the received doctrine of purgatory is at variance with Scripture, cruel to the better sort of Christians, and administering deceitful comfort to the irreligious.

That the practice of celebrating divine service in an unknown tongue is a great corruption.

That forced confession is an unauthorized and dangerous practice.

That the direct invocation of saints is a dangerous practice, as tending to give, often actually giving, to creatures the honour and reliance due to the Creator alone.

That there are not seven sacraments.

That the Roman doctrine of Tradition is unscriptural.

That the claim of the Pope to be universal bishop is against Scripture and antiquity.

I might add other points in which also I protest against the Church of Rome, but I think it enough to make my confession in Hall's order, and so leave it."—No. 38, p. 11.

Surely one may well say, "look on this picture, and on that!" And "unsophisticated Protestants" will wonder, that Mr. Boardman, in his examination in detail, had not made use of this plump catalogue, to help out his lean list. Or, if that were "too much of a good thing," he might have found, in No. 71,[1] a selected specimen of "*practical* grievances" merely,

[1] Entitled "On the Controversy with the Romanists."

"to which Christians are subjected in the Roman Communion, and which should be put into the foreground in the controversy: 1, The denial of the cup to the laity; 2, The necessity of the priest's intention to the validity of the sacraments; 3, The necessity of confession; 4, The unwarranted anathemas of the Roman Church; 5, Purgatory; 6, Invocation of saints; 7, Images."

It is but just to say, that, though the definition of "worst errors" be so vague and scanty, the Rev. Mr. Boardman does, in rambling through his centenary of pages, touch on some few of the heads, (included it may be in his "affiliated points,") presented in these summaries. And though we might, in justice, hold him to his definition, and limit ourselves to the examination of his proofs, that, on the subjects there stated, Oxford does but echo Rome; we shall pursue him in his rambles, and examine briefly, and in his own order, every point which he presents. Before we do so, it is but just—since such an outcry has been raised against the Oxford writers, as teaching Popery—that some few of the passages, in which they treat the subject, be presented here.

There was published, during the last year, the fourth edition of a letter by the Rev. Dr. Pusey,[1] to his diocesan, the Bishop of Oxford, "on the tendency to Romanism imputed to doctrines held of old, as now, in the English Church;" to which is added "an

[1] It were but a moderate request, to ask of all who feel an interest in this deeply agitated question—at least, of all who without examination, have entertained the charge of Popery against the Oxford Tracts—that they would carefully read this pamphlet. It can be had in an American edition.

Appendix, containing extracts from the Tracts of the Times, and other works." The Index to that Appendix presents the following, with other items, under the head of "POPERY—incurable; a falling off; pestilential; malicious and cruel; rebellious; tyrannical; an insanity; an evil spirit; heretical; exclusive; unscriptural; presumptuous; persecuting; an Antichrist." "An unsophisticated Protestant," beguiled by the "wolf" cry of Popery, against these writers, might well exclaim, "Call you this backing your friends?"

POPERY OPPOSED TO THE BIBLE.

"You have some misgivings, it seems, lest the doctrine I have been advocating 'should lead to Popery.' I will not, by way of answer, say, that the question is not, whether it will *lead to Popery*, but whether it is *in the Bible;* because it would bring the Bible and Popery into one sentence, and seem to imply the possibility of a 'communion' between 'light and darkness.' No; it is the very enmity I feel against the Papistical corruptions of the Gospel, which leads me to press upon you a doctrine of Scripture, [the visible Church] which we are sinfully surrendering, and the Church of Rome has faithfully retained."—No. 20, p. 1.

CRUELTY AND CORRUPTION OF ROME.

"These false notions in themselves aggrandized the character of the priesthood: and as such, it was part of the unhappy policy of Rome to countenance them; and while (to take the mildest view) she narrowly observed the erroneous tendencies, which were almost unavoidably mixed up in the minds of individuals with the reformed doctrine, she had no sense for her own. She thought no deeds cruel, which would remove the motes that threatened to darken her sister's eye, but perceived not the beam in her own. While repressing, even by the shedding of blood, the slightest approximation to

the reformed doctrine, she rebuked not errors which entrenched on the authority of our Lord."—No. 81, p. 8.

"Mark how each Creed stands in that test reveal'd,
Romish and Swiss and Lutheran novelties!
As in the light of Spenser's magic shield,
Falsehood lets fall her poisoned cup and flies,
Rome's seven-headed monster sees and dies!"

Lyra Apostolica, 97.

"The flood-gates on me open wide,
And headlong rushes in the turbulent tide
Of lusts, and heresies! A motley troop they come;
And old imperial Rome
Looks up, and lifts again, half dead,
Her seven-horned head;" &c.—*Ibid.* 111.

"And now thou sendest foes
Bred from thy womb, lost Church! to mock the throes
Of thy free child, thou cruel-natured Rome!"—*Ibid.* 171.

UNION WITH ROME IMPOSSIBLE.

"Truly when one surveys the grandeur of their system, a sigh arises in the thoughtful mind, to think that we should be separate from them; Cum talis sis, utinam, noster esses!—But, alas! AN UNION IS IMPOSSIBLE. Their communion is infected with heterodoxy; we are bound to flee it as a pestilence. They have established a lie in the place of God's truth; and, by their claim of immutability in doctrine, cannot undo the sin they have committed. They cannot repent. Popery must be destroyed; it cannot be reformed." —No. 20, p. 3.

"Having adopted the fiction of a letter from the Pope to certain members of the Church, as being his emissaries, it became necessary, by disguise, or omission, or perversion, to conceal whatever would have disturbed the unity of the drama. For instance, you play not unfrequently upon the words which one of these writers addresses to the Church of Rome—'Cum talis sis, utinam noster esses!' And who would not echo the wish . . . that she, as ourselves have been, might be restored to her primeval purity, when she was once the guardian of Christian truth; that God would 'break the

yoke of her burden, the staff on her shoulder, and the rod of her oppressor?' Taken, then, in their obvious sense, the words are the expression of every Christian heart. Your fiction, however, required that they should express a desire for union with Rome AS SHE IS; and in this sense accordingly you quote them. The very next words of the writer contradict this. He proceeds (and to prevent the possibility of a mistake, he has printed these words in capitals): 'But, alas! AN UNION IS IMPOSSIBLE.' Honesty required the insertion of these words; but they would have spoiled the jest, and so they are omitted."—*Pusey's earnest Remonstrance to the author of the Pope's letter (vide Vol. iii. Tracts)*, p. 8.

ROME NOT CATHOLIC.

"The deep and sincere dread with which Hooker regarded the errors and aggressions of Rome is apparent in every part of his writings; and so much the more instructive will it prove, should we find him of his own accord embracing those Catholic opinions and practices, which some, in their zeal for Popery, may have too lightly parted with, but which, as Rome alone could not give them, so neither should we allow her indirectly to take them away."—*Keble's Preface to Hooker*, p. iv.

ROME EXORBITANT.

"The freedom of the Anglican Church may be vindicated against the exorbitant claims of Rome, and yet no disparagement ensue of the authority inherent in the Catholic Apostolical Church."—*Keble's Sermon on Primitive Tradition*, p. 6.

ROME IN PERNICIOUS ERROR.

"We are naturally, if not reasonably, jealous of the word Tradition, associated as it is in our minds with the undue claims and pernicious errors of Rome."—*Ibid.* p. 20.

ROME A SEAT OF ANTICHRIST.

"Alexandria, the bulwark of the faith in the Holy Trinity, and North Africa, of the unmeritedness of God's free grace, a desolation! Rome, once characterized for steady practical adherence to sound doctrine, a seat of Anti-Christ! Geneva, once proposed as the model of all reformed Churches, and of influence well nigh un-

bounded, and yet immediately the food of Socinianism, and now a prey to the heresy which came forth, but was for the time ejected, also from its bosom."—*Pusey on Baptism*, p. 201.

ROME A PERSECUTOR.

"From the time that the Church of Rome began to forsake the principles of the Church Catholic, and grasp after human means, she began also to take evil means for good ends, and incurring the Apostolic curse on those who 'do evil that good may come,' took at last evil means for evil ends. She, the Apostolic Church of the West, consecrated by Apostolic blood, showed herself rather the descendant of them who slew the Apostles, and 'thought that they did God service,' stained herself with the blood of the saints, that on her might come all the righteous blood which was shed within her; even of the very Apostles, who had shed blood for her. There is not an enormity which has been practised against people or kings by miscreants, in the name of God, but the divines of that unhappy Church have abetted or justified."—*Pusey's Sermon on the Fifth of November*, p. 29.

ROME IMPIOUS.

"The principle of the Romish Church was expediency; it was a plotting, scheming, worldly spirit, having at first God's glory for its end, but seeking it by secular means, and at last, in punishment, left to seek its own glory, and set itself up in the place of God."—*Ibid.* p. 31.

OXFORD OPPOSED TO ROME.

"Whether we be right or wrong, our theory of religion has a meaning, and that really distinct from Romanism. They maintain that faith depends upon the Church; we, that the Church is built upon the faith. By Church Catholic we mean the Church Universal; they, those branches of it which are in communion with Rome. Again, they understand by the faith, whatever the Church at any time declares to be faith; we, what it has actually so declared from the beginning. Both they and we anathematize those who deny the faith; but they extend the condemnation to all who question any de-

cree of the Roman Church; we apply it to those only who deny any article of the original Apostolic creed."—*Newman on Romanism*, p. 259.

ROME VENAL.

"Hence the charge, not unfounded as regards Romanism, that it views, or tends to view, the influences of grace, not as the operations of a living God, but as a something to bargain about, and buy, and traffic with, as if religion were, not an approach to things above us, but a commerce with our equals, concerning things we can master." —*Newman on Justification*, p. 316.

ROME DEMONIAC.

"We must take and deal with things as they are, not as they pretend to be. If we are induced to believe the professions of Rome, and make advances towards her, as if a sister or a mother Church, which in theory she is, we shall find too late that we are in the arms of a pitiless and unnatural relation, who will but triumph in the arts which have inveigled us within her reach. No; dismissing the dreams which the romance of early Church history, and the high doctrines of Catholicism will raise in the inexperienced mind, let us be sure that she is our enemy, and will do us a mischief if she can. For in truth she is a Church beside herself, abounding in noble gifts and rightful titles, but unable to use them religiously; crafty, obstinate, wilful, malicious, cruel, unnatural, as madmen are, or rather, she may be said to resemble a demoniac, . . . ruled within by an inexorable spirit."—*Newman on Romanism, pp.* 102, 103.

Such is a very little sample of the "Popery," which Oxford writers are inculcating, and, "with prodigious efficiency," from pulpit and by press. Mr. Boardman may well say, "there is something peculiar in the *way* in which Romanisim is taught in these writings." Very peculiar! Were it not better to agree with the Quarterly Review, that they who condemn the Oxford writings, as favouring Popery, "are speak-

ing in utter ignorance?" With Mr. Baden Powell, who has written against them, ("Tradition Unveiled,") that all sensible persons will agree in rejecting any notion, that they encourage Popery, as flowing, either from "ignorance of the question," or "disregard of distinct avowals?" Nay, with the author of "Ancient Christianity," that "the cry of Popery, raised by certain of the opponents of the Oxford doctrines, must be granted to do as little credit to the discrimination of those who raise it, as to their candour;"[1] that "the ill-judged attempt to confound these doctrines with Romanism, or to disparage them, unheard, by an implication in the same obloquy, and thus to use an unfair advantage, drawn from popular prejudices, is to be strongly condemned, and carefully avoided;"[1] that "whatever analogies may seem to connect the doctrines of the Oxford Tracts with Popery, the difference between the two is such, as that those must certainly be disappointed, who, hastily snatching up the rusty swords and spears of the Reformers, rush, so accoutred, upon the Oxford divines?"[1] Leaving the admirers of Mr. Isaac Taylor, who are also Popery-hunters, to settle all these points with him, we must pursue the "Correspondent," on his "winding way."

Specification I. "One of the first characteristics of the Oxford writings, which will strike an unsophisticated Protestant, as indicating a strong Popish tendency, is *the extraordinary language in which the Romish and Protestant Churches are respectively spoken of.*" (p. 31.) The citation from the Tracts, to

[1] Pp. 24, 43, American edition.

prove this point, is taken from No. 71. "The English Church, as such, is *not* Protestant, only politically, that is, externally, or so far as it has been made an establishment, and subjected to national, and foreign influences. It claims to be merely *Reformed*, not Protestant, and it repudiates any fellowship[!1] with the mixed multitude, which crowd together, whether at home or abroad, under a mere political banner." And yet this is historically true. The title "Protestant,"2 as Dr. Pusey justly says, "has no where been adopted" by the Church of England, "in any formulary or document of hers." Why

---

1 The exclamation here is Mr. Boardman's own. It is too plain, "Hinc llæ lachrymæ!" That is to say, in the vernacular, "Ay, there's the rub!" But, really, it cannot be avoided. The "Protestant denominations," complained of, as *unchurched* at Oxford, may "go farther," (to Geneva,) "and fare worse." For what says Master Calvin of them, one and all? "If they will give us such an hierarchy, in which the bishops have such a pre-eminence, as that they do not refuse to be subject unto Christ; I will confess, that they are worthy of all anathemas, if any such there be, who will not reverence it, and submit themselves to it, with the utmost obedience." "Holy Mother," to use Mr. Boardman's phrase, scarcely could do more.

2 "The title, as simply negative," says Dr. Pusey, in his Letter, p. 13, "is ill fitted to characterize the faith of any portion of the Christian Church. It speaks only of what we do not hold, not of what we do hold, and is accordingly in some countries, as Italy, adopted by those who intend thereby to deny, not the errors only held by Rome, but the faith which she has retained." * * * "For the most part, Protestant is there the title assumed by the infidel. And this abuse of the title lies in its very nature: it is actually more real to describe ourselves by what we are, than to state merely what we are not, lest, in time, our faith should shrink into the mere denial of error, instead of being a confession of the truth." "And in like manner," says Mr. Newman, in his letter to Dr. Faussitt, (pp. 29, 30.) "if persons, aware that names are things, conscientiously think that the name of Protestantism, is productive of serious mischief—if it be the property of heresy and schism, as much as of orthodoxy—if it be but a negative word, such as almost forces on its professors the idea of a vague, indefinite creed; makes them turn their thoughts to how much they may

should her writers, then, not say so? Is their saying so to be taken as a proof of Popery; and this, although, in the same breath, they claim to be "Reformed?"

What the next two extracts have to do with the charge of Popery against the Oxford writers, it is hard to see. Not so hard to see, however, how one bent on heaping up ill will against a cause—which Mr. Boardman ought not to be thought, much less to be—might drop them, with a sanctimonious look, just in the reader's way. The second of them, from the 47th Tract, is in these words: "So far from its

---

doubt, deny, ridicule, or resist, rather than what they believe,—if the religion it generates, mainly consists in a mere attack upon Rome, and tends to be a mere instrument of state purposes,—if it tends to swallow up devotion in worldliness, and the Church in the executive,—if it damps, discourages, stifles the ancient Catholic system, which, if true in thebeginning, is true at all times; and if, on the other hand, there be nothing in our formularies obliging us to profess it,—and if external circumstances have so changed, that what it was inexpedient or impossible to do formerly, is both possible and expedient now,—these considerations, I conceive may form a reason for abandoning the word." Both Dr. Pusey and Mr. Newman refer to a most interesting historical statement, in Birch's Life of Tillotson, of the steady repudiation of the term, "lest they should thereby seem in any way to identify themselves with the foreign churches," by the Lower House of Convocation, in 1689. It may be found also in Tract for the Times, 71.—And now lest any reader should think that too much space is occupied with this point, he is requested to consider, that, with the mass, "abandoning a word" is very much the same as *abandoning the thing;* and that those who attempt to lead the mass, have carefully sought to make it seem so in this instance. Mr. Boardman, evidently means that repudiating the names "Protestant" and "Protestant Episcopalian," shall have "a voice potential," with his readers. At any rate, it will be seen, it does not necessarily prove Popery. Especially it should be borne in mind, that it is a question which does not at all concern American Churchmen, on their own account. Our branch of the Church Catholic expressly takes the style. "the Protestant Episcopal Church, in the United States of America."

being a strange thing, that Protestant sects are not '*in Christ*,' in the same fulness that we are, it is more accordant to the scheme of the world, that they should *lie between us and heathenism*." An ugly look has this, no doubt, in all sectarian eyes. Yet, read the article together, and more than half the teeth are drawn. Take an example, from the former portion of the Tract. It is entitled, "The visible Church." "You say that my doctrine of the one Catholic Church, in effect excludes Dissenters, nay, Presbyterians, from salvation. Far from it. * * * * * * * I have known those among Presbyterians, whose piety, resignation, cheerfulness, and affection, under trying circumstances, have been such as to make me say to myself, on the thought of my own higher privileges, 'Woe unto thee, Chorazin, woe unto thee, Bethsaida!' Where there is little given, little will be required; and that return, though little, has its own peculiar loveliness, as an acceptable sacrifice to Him, who singled out for praise the widow's two mites!" Now this may be very weak, and very erroneous, and very absurd, if any one shall choose to say so. But it is not Popish. It surely is not uncharitable. And yet the writer of it, read in Mr. Boardman's extract, seems scarcely less ferocious than

> "The Anthropophagi, and men whose heads
> Do grow beneath their shoulders."

The extract, from the British Critic, appears to be used just as a hook, to hang a Letter on, taken from the Banner of the Cross, commendatory of that Journal; that so the writer of the Letter may be made to endorse all Oxford. In one view, there is ground

for gratitude; since it may add to the large, and daily increasing, patronage, extended to the enterprising importers of this most admirable Periodical. Of course, it will not be pretended, that to recommend a Magazine, or a Review, to general circulation, is to divide responsibility with its Editor. From any just accountableness for that most able Journal, the writer of the Letter has no reason, and as little inclination, to withdraw himself.

Specification II. "The Oxford School" *deplore "the glorious Reformation as a calamity.*" "They are *not quite as explicit on this point,* (*and many others,*) now, *as they probably will be hereafter.*" (p. 33.) Suppose we wait, and see! It would be hard to hang a man for a murder, which he will "probably" commit "hereafter." But Mr. Boardman deals largely in this probable, paulo-post-future Popery. "One of them, however, the late Rev. Richard H. Froude, a favourite pupil of Mr. Newman's, and who is highly praised by the British Critic, did not hesitate to characterize that work as 'the detestable Reformation!'" It is very probable that he has done so, though that precise expression, after several hours' search, is not found; and Mr. Boardman is very sparing of his references. But let it be granted, that he did. He certainly has used similar expressions; and the more's the pity. But what then? Did not the Editors of "Froude's Remains," know that he had used such language? Did they not know that it would be caught at, dwelt on, and made the most of? Must they not have seen that it would be relied on, as it has, far more than all their publications, to prove

them Papists? And is this the conduct of "Jesuits in disguise?" Do men, who wish to steal a march, put bells upon their horses' feet, instead of shoeing them "with felt?" Are they who seek their own, disposed to put the worst side outward? The present writer never thought well of that particular publication. Many of those, who think most favourably of the Oxford writings, have regretted it. The Quarterly Reviewer, to whom reference has been made, "reluctant" "to say any thing harsh of men who are evidently fighting the battles of the Church, with no less purity of intention, than energy and talent," thinks it "strange, and lamentable, that such a work should have been published with the sanction of their name." What Mr. Perceval has thought of it, the reader is requested to ascertain from the conclusion of his most interesting Letter, in the Appendix to this Brief Examination. But, we repeat, what then? Had they not a right to publish the Remains of their departed friend? Is not the press as free to them, as to those who call them, Papists in disguise? (Verily, a thin disguise!) Are they, alone, of all who live in this our age, which clamours so for the free exercise of private judgment, to be debarred from using it? Grant that their judgment is unsound! Grant that they have acted indiscreetly! Grant that they convict themselves of utmost rashness and absurdity! If they are enemies of the truth, is it not so much the better? May it not be God's way to make the wrath of man to praise him? Should not all "unsophisticated Protestants" rejoice, that, now, at least, the mask is thrown aside? But, no! This

would not do. There must be "double corners." On one side of the same page, they must be charged with the most subtle sophistry; while, on the other, "odious Protestantism" must be arrayed, from Froude's Remains, in double capitals. To-day, they are condemned for "little qualifying words." To-morrow, for the most unmeasured and intemperate anti-reformationism. Can both be true? If either charge were clear, would both be brought? Until the prosecution has determined what the crime is, shall the accused be hung? To an honest mind, the very extravagance of Mr. Froude's expressions will be the best protection of his Editors from any charge, involving their integrity. Whatever they may prove, they disprove dissimulation. They repudiate the shadow of a suspicion of a secret influence for Popery.

Let it not be supposed that we admit, even for a single moment, that Mr. Froude's Remains do authorize the slightest shadow of a suspicion of Popery against him. "I am sorry," says Mr. Newman, writing to Dr. Faussett, "considering that you have used such strong terms concerning Mr. Froude's volumes, you have not judged it right to state, that they contain as strong expressions against Popery, as your pamphlet contains against *them*." Several instances are given. "The Romanists [are not, as one had suggested, schismatics in England, and Catholics abroad, but they] are wretched Tridentines every where." *Remains*, i, p. 34.—"I never could be a Romanist." *Ibid.* —Speaking of the Council of Trent, he calls it "the atrocious Council;" and says, "it has altogether changed my notions of the Roman Catholics, and

made me wish for a total overthrow of their system." i. 308. —As, well he might; for, in another place he says, "I really do think them idolaters." Preface, xiii.

The British Critic, of January, 1840, says Mr. Boardman, (p. 33.) speaks of "the impieties of the 16th Century," "in obvious allusion to the same event," the Reformation. After a diligent search for these six words, through 250 pages octavo, (no reference is given to the page,) I have found them. They are on the 70th page, and the whole paragraph should be read together. Thus read, it is "obvious" that they have no such allusion: and one should have been hard pressed for an occasion to condemn the British Critic, to resort to that.

Specification iii. "The Oxfordists *scout the idea that the Papal power is the great 'apostacy' and 'Antichrist' of prophecy.*"—Now it may be remarked here, that it is not the practice of these writers to "scout" any thing. They write with calmness, gentleness and moderation; without violence, and without invective. They bear in mind—would that all Christians did!—the example of that great Archangel, who, contending with the very devil, brought no "railing accusation," but simply said, "The Lord rebuke thee!" Speaking, for instance, in the Tract No. 71, (p 31.) of the allowance to be made for the Anglican Reformers, from the peculiar difficulties of their condition, they say: "these considerations cannot fairly be taken in disparagement of the celebrated men, who were the instruments of Providence in the work, and who, doubtless, felt far more keenly than is here expressed the perplexities of their situation,

but they will serve perhaps to reconcile our minds to our circumstances in these latter ages of the Church, and will cherish in us a sobriety of mind, salutary in itself, and calculated more than any thing else to arm us against the arguments of Rome, and turn us in affection and sympathy towards the afflicted Church which has been the 'mother of our new birth.' They will but lead us to confess that she is, in a measure, in that position which we fully ascribe to her Latin sister, *in captivity;* and they will make us understand and duly use the prayers of our wisest doctors, and rulers, such as Bishop Andrews—'that God would please to look down upon his holy Catholic and Apostolic Church, *in her captivity;* to visit her once more with his salvation, and to bring her out, to serve him, in the beauty of holiness.'" Who would think that any Christian "Pastor" would take offence at language like this? Or that these devout reflections, together with those beautiful lines, from the Christian Year—

> "And O! by all the pangs and fears
> Fraternal spirits know,
> When for an elder's shame the tears
> Of wakeful anguish flow,
> Speak gently of our sister's fall:
> Who knows but gentle love
> May win her, at our patient call,
> The surer way to prove—"

could make Mr. Boardman "rejoice" that these writers "have renounced the name of 'Protestants.'"?

> "Tantæne animis cœlestibus iræ?"

Is this the charity that "rejoiceth not in iniquity,

but rejoiceth in the truth;" that "thinketh no evil," and "is not easily provoked?"

One would be led to think that the Oxford writers had laid themselves largely out, to prove that Papal Rome is *not* the Antichrist. So far from it, until the fifth volume,[1] which contains four noble "Advent sermons on Antichrist"—the Pope is welcome, quite, to all the flattery *they* give him—the Tracts for the Times scarcely, if at all, approach the subject. In his Letter to the Bishop of Oxford, Dr. Pusey just alludes to the fierce outcry raised against them, for what they have not, rather than for what they have, said, on this subject. And, brief as his allusion is, (but ten lines and a half,) it is too long for Mr. Boardman to introduce entire; and long enough to suffer gross misrepresentation at his hands. What Dr. Pusey *does* say is as follows: the lines in brackets being those which Mr. Boardman finds it convenient to omit; and that, without the slightest indication of omission. "It is Popery again, and disaffection to the Church, to doubt whether the Pope is *the*[2] Antichrist, [even while asserting that there is much Anti-Christian[3] in the system of Rome; that

---

[1] Not reprinted in this country, and, it may safely be asserted, not comprehended in Mr. Boardman's examination of "details."

[2] Mr. Boardman, in quoting Dr. Pusey, has Italics for "Popery," but none for "*the*."

[3] More than this, Dr. Pusey refers in a note to several passages in his Appendix, taken from the "Tracts," and kindred writings, in which Rome is expressly declared as Anti-Christian. Among the rest, to a sentence of his own (cited page 32) "Rome, once characterized for steady practical adherence to sound doctrine, a seat of Anti-Christ;" and to the following from his "Earnest Re-

as in St. John's time there were many Anti-Christs,[1] and the mystery of iniquity had begun already to work in St. Paul's, and his discussions were in a great degree realized by the Gnostic heresies, so there is also Anti-Christianism *in* the system of Rome,] though Anti-Christ himself be not yet revealed, nor may we yet know when, or among whom he will appear." Now the question at issue, not being, whether or not Papal Rome is Anti-Christ; but, *whether the Oxford writers, doubtful as to that conclusion, are thus and therefore Papists*, more than enough has been cited to relieve all reasonable ap-

---

monstrance," at the beginning of the third volume of the Tracts. "Those who wish well to our Church will now see, who, under Almighty God, are the real upholders of sound doctrine among us; * * * * * they will see that the cry of Popery is but a feint, devised by the arch-enemy of the Church, whereby to hurry men down the steep of ultra-Protestantism to its uniform end, 'the denial of the Lord that bought them.' And knowing that that Church alone is safe who guards the deposit of sound doctrine committed unto her, they will not be scared by shadows to abandon the realities; or, shrinking from the reproach our forefathers bore faithfully, fall into the toils, on either side spread for them, whether of THE SOCINIAN OR PAPAL ANTI-CHRISTIAN."

[1] "He is antichrist that denieth the Father and the Son." *St. John* 1. ii. 22. "Every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh, is not of God: and this is that spirit of Antichrist whereof we have heard that it should come, and even now already is it in the world." 1. iv. 3. Here, from an inspired pen, are two different descriptions of antichrist. Does inspiration contradict itself? No. The same divinely-taught Instructer solves the apparent inconsistency. "Little children, it is the last time: and as ye have heard that antichrist shall come, even now *there are many antichrists:* whereby we know that it is the last time." 1. ii. 18. Why should Mr. Boardman tie the subject so much more closely up, than the Evangelist St. John? Why should Dr. Pusey be compelled to say, Rome is *the* antichrist: or be denounced for Popery, when he does say (though Mr. Boardman carefully conceals it) that "there is much anti-christian in the system of Rome," and that Rome is "a seat of Antichrist?" Verily, such dictation, to a word, not only, but a letter, savors more of Rome, than any thing in Dr. Pusey. But the Reformers declare the Pope to be Antichrist,

prehension. For Mr. Boardman's sweeping sentence—there are small Vaticans, as well as large—"the corner stone of the Reformation was laid on the doctrine that THE PAPAL CHURCH IS ANTICHRIST;" it may be safely left with one remark—assertion is not proof!

What follows of the second Letter is chiefly harping on one string—the offence of those who "spurn all alliance with any, and every, Protestant denomination, as 'the offspring of heresy and schism.'" And—though we must believe him when he begs us "not to *fancy* that these passages excite any personal feeling" in his breast, because he has the infelicity "to be attached to one of these no-church organizations"—Virgil's enumeration of the slights of Juno,

"spretæque injuria *formæ*,"

will rise, unbidden, to the thought. We trust that it is we, and not Mr. Boardman, who are mistaken in

---

says Mr. Boardman. Well, were they infallible? Does not Mr. Boardman allow (p. 75) that they used unguarded language? Might they not fairly claim, as Dr. Pusey claims, the latitude of the Apostle John? In one place, before the Queen's commissioners, Cranmer's language was most circumspect. "Christ saith, that Antichrist shall be. And who shall he be? Forsooth, he that advanceth himself above all other creatures. Now, if there be none already that hath advanced himself after such sort besides the Pope, *then, in the meantime, let him be Antichrist.*" *Fox, Acts and Monuments*, fol. 1694. iii. 548. But, we repeat, even Cranmer is not to be held infallible. "The Church," says Mr. Newman, in his letter to Dr. Faussett, "is not bound up with individuals." And again, "we are not Cranmerites, nor Jewelists, but Catholics; members, not of a sect or party, but of the Catholic and Apostolic Church." pp. 27, 28. Let it not be forgotten, the question here is, not whether Papal Rome is *the* Antichrist: but whether they, who are not sure that she is, are thus, and therefore, Papists.

this matter. If not, the only comfort we can administer to him—and it must go to meet his whole array of insinuations, that they, who will not go Genevaward, *must* take their quarters with the "BABYLONIAN BEAST OF ROME"—is, in these words of Richard Hooker: "To say, that in nothing they may be followed, which are of the Church of Rome, were violent and extreme. Some things they do, in that they are men; in that they are wise men and Christian men, some things; some things, in that they are men misled and blinded with error. As far, as they follow reason and truth, we fear not to tread the selfsame steps wherein they have gone, and be their followers. Where Rome keepeth that which is ancienter and better, others whom we much more affect, leaving it for newer, and changing it for worse; we had rather follow the perfections of them whom we like not, than, in defects, resemble those whom we love." How Mr. Boardman can ever write hereafter, "the judicious Hooker," it is for him to show.

The hit at Archbishop Laud, for maintaining that, "there can be no true church without Bishops," and the complacent quotation, from the Christian Observer,[1] of the praise of those divines of England, who have blessed God for their own exalted privileges, "without impeaching other communions," still whisper of *the pinching shoe;* the more as they have no connection whatever with the charge of Popery.

---

[1] If Mr. Boardman will look through the volumes of this periodical, he will find much to qualify his praise of it. We recommend, as a sedative, among others, the Review of Neal's History of the Puritans.

We cannot now go into this controversy, and need not. It is well left in the hands of Hobart, the Onderdonks, Bowden and Chapman. It will suffice to cite in this place, the authority of Ignatius, who was taught by John, (in his Epistle to the Trallians,) that without the Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons, "there is no Church;" the allowance of Martin Luther, (*Resolutions,*) that "each state ought to have one Bishop of its own, by divine right;" the protestation of Beza (*Answer to Saravia*) "if there are any, as you will not easily persuade me, who would reject the whole order of Bishops, God forbid that any man in his senses should assent to their madness;" and his devout petition for the Episcopacy of the Church of England, "let her enjoy that singular blessing of God, which I pray may be perpetual;" the challenge of Richard Hooker, (*Ecclesiastical Polity,*) "we require you to find out but one Church on the face of the whole earth, that hath been ordered by your discipline, or hath not been ordered by ours, that is to say, by Episcopal regiment, since the time, that the blessed Apostles were here conversant;" and finally, though, at the risk of repetition—what Mr. Boardman surely cannot censure—the anathema of Calvin," (*Necessity of reforming the Church,*) "if they will give us such an hierarchy, in which the Bishops have such a pre-eminence, as they do not refuse to be subject unto Christ, I will confess, that they are worthy of all anathemas, if any such there be, who will not reverence it, and submit themselves to it, with the utmost obedience;" explained and applied, by Mons. Daille,

(*Bingham's French Church's apology for the Church of England*) "Calvin honoured all Bishops, that were not subjects of the Pope, such as were the prelates of England. We confess, that the foundation of their charge, is good, and lawful, established by the Apostles according to the command of Christ." If the opinions of this worshipful company should seem to out-Laud Laud, it is no fault of ours.

SPECIFICATION IV. *The Oxford system is "a Religion of sacraments;" "the Oxford Religion is, like Popery, a sacramental religion."*—Is it meant to say, that Popery is the only "sacramental religion;" unless the same can be proved of that of Oxford? And, if this be the meaning, is not the ground of all religion well nigh given up to Popery, at once? Has God ever revealed himself to man, but in a "sacramental religion?"[1] Were there not sacraments in Eden—outward signs of inward grace? Was not the tree of knowledge such, although forbidden; by the outward eating of which the man became, as God himself hath said, "as one of us, to know good and evil?" Was not the tree of life, as such, divinely guarded; "lest he put forth his hand, and eat, and live forever?" Was not the patriarchal religion sacramental? The ark, which was the Church to the sin-wasted world; the sign of Noah's covenant with God, now "round

[1] "Thus doth God make known His secret purpose to His Church; first, he declareth His mercy by His Word; then He sealeth it, and assureth it by His Sacraments. In the Word, we have His promises—in the Sacraments, we SEE them."—*Bishop Jewel.* And again, "If we were nothing else but soul, He would give us His grace barely and alone, without giving it to any creature, as He doth to His angels; but seeing our spirit is drowned in our body, and our understanding dull, therefore we receive His grace by sensible signs."

about the throne, in sight like unto an emerald;" the bloody rite of circumcision, the seal and pledge to Abraham of everlasting blessedness, in which the nations of the earth should all be blessed, through circumcision of the heart? Was not the covenant made with Moses sacramental? The rite of circumcision established, as its seal; the paschal Lamb, that bleeding picture of "our Passover;" the daily sacrifice, the blood of the atonement, all fulfilled and realized when He "entered in, once," "by his own blood;" "the manna, which was spiritual meat;" the water in the wilderness, their "spiritual drink"—"for they drank of that spiritual rock which followed them, and that rock was Christ?" Not that any of these were, in the true sense, sacraments of salvation, which the two sacraments of the Gospel are; but that they were all "figures of the true," and the dispensations which they accompanied, clearly "sacramental." And when Christ came, "not to destroy, but to fulfil," what was the occupation of the last night before his crucifixion, but the institution of the Holy Eucharist? What was the subject of his last exhortation to his Apostles, but the command to baptize all nations? Is Mr. Boardman willing to give all this up to Rome? Is he willing to accept, and teach, a religion that is *not* "sacramental?" And, if he undertakes to do so, is he sure of stopping short of Deism: a religion without sacraments, because a religion without a Saviour—destitute of the sign, because rejecting the thing signified? This Mr. Boardman does not mean: for he allows that "Protestants have never excluded sacraments from the 'means of

grace'"—meaning that *all* Protestants have not. But neither is Dr. Pusey to be understood, as Mr. Boardman's omissions and Italics make him seem to mean. He no where teaches—no Oxford writer teaches—that *what Mr. Boardman means* by "spiritual regeneration"[1] is "inseparably linked with baptism;" nor yet, that "spiritual edification, strength and comfort are imparted to "the communicant," unless "he feeds, in his heart, by faith, with thanksgiving"—"faith" he expressly says, "being the *sine qua non*, the necessary condition, for duly receiving it." But, to get the truth, the whole connected passage,[2] which Mr. Boardman takes, in parts, and disconnected, must be placed before the reader.

"It will be found, that much more has been done in awakening Churchmen to the truth of the Apostolical Commission as a fact, and to the admission of it as a duty, than to the enjoyment of it as a privilege. If asked what is the use of adhering to the Church, they will commonly answer, that it is commanded, that all acts of obedience meet with their reward from Almighty God, and this in the

---

[1] Though yet in Cranmer's sense (see afterwards); and Paul's, Titus iii. 5; and Christ's, John iii. 3, 5.

[2] We are not concerned to vindicate the character of Alexander Knox, whom Mr. Boardman undertakes to call "the venerated father of Oxfordism:" though Mr. Newman (Lectures on Justification, p. 434) says, he has too little acquaintance with his works, to form an opinion of their theological merits; and Dr. Pusey, (*Scriptural Views of Holy Baptism*, pp. 14—20.) plainly dissents from his opinions. But, it should be said, in passing, lest we seem to adopt injustice by our silence, that he does a wrong both to him, and the British Critic. The reader who knows no more of Mr. Knox than Mr. Boardman tells him, will infer that both he and the Reviewer gloried in something other than the Cross. A few sentences of what the latter does say will arrest this unjust judgment. "But this, it must be acknowledged, was not precisely the view of redemption which presented itself to the meditations of Alexander Knox. The Cross was *not* the central object of his divinity. In his theological *panorama*, if we may so express it, the Cross seems to

number; but the notion of the Church as the storehouse and direct channel of grace, as a Divine ordinance, not merely to be maintained for order's sake, or because schism is a sin, but to be approached joyfully and expectantly as a definite instrument, or rather the appointed means, of spiritual blessings,—as an ordinance which conveys secret strength and life to every one who shares in it, unless there be some actual moral impediment in his own mind,—this is a doctrine which as yet is but faintly understood among us. Nay, our subtle enemy has so contrived, that by affixing to this blessed truth the stigma of Popery, numbers among us are effectually deterred from profiting by a gracious provision, intended for the comfort of our faith, but in their case wasted.

The particular deficiency here alluded to may also be described by referring to another form under which it shows itself, viz. the *à priori* reluctance in those who believe the Apostolical Commission, to appropriate to it the power of consecrating the Lord's Supper; as if there were some antecedent improbability in God's gifts being lodged in particular observances, and distributed in a particular way; and as if the strong wish, or moral worth, of the individual could create in the outward ceremony a virtue which it had not received from above. Rationalistic, or (as they may be more properly called) carnal notions concerning the Sacraments, and, on the other hand, a superstitious apprehension of resting in them, and a slowness to believe the possibilty of God's having literally blessed ordinances with invisible power, have, alas! infected a large mass of men in our communion. There are those whose "word will eat as doth a

---

have held a somewhat remote and subordinate position. It appears there, fast by the entrance into the kingdom of God, instead of being lifted up on the heights of the Acropolis. In other words, his chief reliance was, not so much on what Christ had once for all effected for the whole human race, as upon that which Christ stands pledged to accomplish within the heart of every true believer. By the grand propitiation—he conceived—the whole world was placed within the possibility of salvation. To him, therefore, the blood of the covenant, though it spoke of far better things than were ever uttered by the tongue of man, yet spoke only of redemption offered; while the work of the Spirit in the human soul, spoke not only of redemption *offered*, but of redemption *realized*." Whether the reader approve this view or not, it is not what Mr. Boardman left him to suppose.

canker;" and it is to be feared, that we have been over-near certain celebrated Protestant teachers, Puritan or Latitudinarian, and have suffered in consequence. Hence we have almost embraced the doctrine, that God conveys grace only through the instrumentality of the mental energies, that is, through faith, prayer, active spiritual contemplations, or (what is called) communion with God, in contradiction to the primitive view, according to which the Church and her sacraments are the ordained and direct visible means of conveying to the soul what is in itself supernatural and unseen. For example, *would not most men maintain, on the first view of the subject, that to administer the Lord's Supper to infants, or to the dying and apparently insensible, however consistently pious and believing in their past lives, must be, under all circumstances, and in every conceivable case, a superstition? And yet, neither practice is without the sanction of primitive usage.* And does not this account for the prevailing indisposition to admit that baptism conveys regeneration? Indeed, this may even be set down as the essence of sectarian doctrine, (however its mischief may be restrained or compensated, in the case of individuals,) to consider faith, and not the sacraments, as the proper instrument of justification and other gospel gifts; instead of holding, that the grace of Christ comes to us altogether from without, (as from Him, so through externals of His ordaining,) faith being but the *sine quâ non*, the necessary condition on our parts for duly receiving it."

Now is there even the shadow of fairness, in saying, as Mr. Boardman says, "the sentences I have italicised in the above quotation, disclose, I presume, the real sentiments of these writers, on the nature of the Sacraments?" Is Dr. Pusey undertaking here to teach in full the nature of the Sacraments? Is it more than an allusion, as he passes? Does he mean to recommend the administration of the Lord's Supper, in such cases as he there alludes to? Does he mean to say any more, than that that which once was practised, would now be regarded as a "superstí-

tion?" Does he mean any thing more, than to say, that the notions of men, concerning the Sacraments, and other holy things, have become low, short of faith, and, what they pride themselves with calling, philosophical? Has Mr. Boardman no such trouble to contend with in his pastoral intercourse? Is he prepared to say, just to what point faith may make compromise with the philosophers? Is it not just as true, that in these days, washing seven times in Jordan, to cure a leprosy, would be rejected as a superstition; or Peter's shadow, or a handkerchief, or an apron, from Paul's body, to cure diseases? Yet such things have been.

> "Clay and Siloam's pool we find
> At Heaven's command restored the blind."

God's power, meanwhile, has not been shortened, but man's faith; and who will say that Christianity or the world has been the gainer by the change?

But the question is, whether the doctrine of the Sacraments, as taught at Oxford, "denotes, at once, its affiliation with Rome;" whether "the Oxford religion" is "a sacramental religion" in such sense as to convict itself of "Popery." If it be so, what becomes of Cranmer?

"And for this cause, Christ ordained Baptism in water, *that as sure as we see, feel, and touch water with our bodies*, and be washed with water; so assuredly ought we to believe, when we be baptized, that Christ is verily present with us, and that *by him we be newly born again spiritually, and washed from our sins, and grafted into the stock of Christ's own body*, and be apparelled, clothed, and harnessed with him in such wise, that as the Devil hath no power against Christ, so he hath none against us, so long as we remain grafted in that stock, and be clothed with that apparel, and harnessed

with that armour. So that the water of baptism is as it were, a showing of Christ before our eyes, and a sensible washing, feeling, and groping of him, to the confirmation of the faith which we have in him. And in like manner Christ ordained the Sacrament of his body and blood in bread and wine, to preach unto us that *as our bodies be fed, nourished, and preserved with meat and drink, so (as touching our spiritual life towards God,) we be fed, nourished, and preserved by the body and blood of our Saviour Christ;* and also that he is such a preservation unto us, that neither the devils of hell, nor eternal death, nor sin, can be able to prevail against us, so long as by true and constant faith we be fed and nourished by that meat and drink.—*Cranmer's Remains*, Oxford, 1833, pp. 302, 303.

And again;

"And, when you say that in *baptism we receive the Spirit of Christ*, and *in the sacrament of his body, we receive his very flesh and blood*, this your saying is no small derogation to baptism; wherein we receive, not only the Spirit of Christ, but *also Christ himself, whole body and soul, manhood and Godhead, unto everlasting life.* For St. Paul saith, as many as be baptised in Christ, put Christ upon them. Nevertheless, this is done in divers respects; for in baptism it is done in respect of regeneration, and in the Holy Communion, in respect of nourishment and sustentation."—*Cranmer's Remains*, iii. 65.

If it be so, what becomes of Ridley?

"As the body is nourished by the bread and wine, at the communion, and the soul by grace and Spirit, with the body of Christ; even so in baptism, the body is washed with the visible water, *and the soul cleansed from all filth by the invisible Holy Ghost.*"—*Wordsworth's Life of Latimer*, iii. 238.

If it be so, what becomes of Hooper?

"I believe also the Holy Sacraments, (which are the second mark or badge of the true Church) to be the signs of the reconciliation and great atonement made between God and us, through Jesus Christ. They are seals of the Lord's promises, and are outward and visible pledges and gifts of the inward faith, and are in number only twain;

that is to say Baptism, and the Holy Supper of the Lord. The which two are not void and empty signs but FULL; that is to say, they are not only signs, whereby something is signified, but also, they are such signs as do exhibit and GIVE the thing that they signify indeed."—*Articles upon the Creed*, lviii.

If it be so, what becomes of Latimer?

"Like as Christ was born in rags, so the conversion of the whole world is by rags, by things which are most vile in this world. For what is so common as water? Every foul ditch is full of it; yet we wash out remission of our sins by baptism, for like as he was found in rags, so we must find him by baptism. There we begin; we are washed with water, and then the words are added; for we are baptised in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, whereby the baptism receiveth its strength. Now this sacrament of baptism is a thing of great weight: for it ascertaineth and assureth us, that *like as the water washeth the body, and cleanseth it, so the blood of Christ our Saviour, cleanseth and washeth it from all filth, and uncleanliness of sin.*"—*Latimer's Sermons*, 1824, ii. 347.

If it be so, what becomes of Bradford?

"*As* therefore *in Baptism is given to us the Holy Ghost, and pardon of our sins,* which yet lie not lurking in the water; so in the Lord's Supper is given unto us the communion of Christ's body and blood, without transubstantiation, or including the same in the bread. *By Baptism the old man is put off, the new man is put on; yea, Christ is put on* without transubstantiating the water. And even so it it is in the Lord's Supper."—*Bradford's Sermon on the Lord's Supper, in Wordsworth's life of Latimer*, iii. 236.

If it be so, what becomes of Jewel?

"*The grace of God doth always work with his Sacraments;* but we are taught not to seek the grace in that sign, but to assure ourselves by receiving the sign, that it is given us by the thing possessed. We are not washed from our sins by the water, we are not fed to eternal life by the bread and wine, *but by the precious blood of our Saviour Christ, that lieth hid in these Sacraments.*"—*Of Sacraments.*

Thus it is that the Bishops, Doctors, Martyrs of the Reformation teach a "religion of Sacraments." Such, and only such, is the "Sacramental religion" which the men of Oxford preach. How can they do other, when it is written, in the words of Jesus Christ himself, "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, except a man *be born again*—except a man *be born of water and of the Spirit*—he cannot enter into the kingdom of God;" and again, "He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood *dwelleth in me, and I in him?*" When it is written, in the words of Paul, "According to his mercy *he saved us, by the washing of regeneration*, and renewing of the Holy Ghost;" and again, "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? the bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?" When it is written, in the words of Peter, "Repent and *be baptized* every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, *for the remission of sins*, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost;" and again, "The like figure whereunto, even *baptism doth also now save us.*" But let the whole subject be summed up in the words of Mr. Simeon. "St. Peter says, 'Repent and *be baptized*, every one of you, *for the remission of sins;*' and in another place, 'Baptism doth now save us.' And, speaking elsewhere of baptized persons, who were unfruitful in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ, he says, 'He hath forgotten that he was purged from his old sins.' Does not this very strongly countenance THE IDEA WHICH OUR REFORMERS ENTERTAINED, *that the remission of our sins, and the regeneration of our souls, is attendant*

on the baptismal rite." * * * * * "Let me then speak the truth before God: though I am no Arminian, *I do think the refinements of Calvin have done great harm in the Church; they have driven multitudes from the plain and popular way of speaking, used by the inspired writers*, and have made them unreasonably and unscripturally squeamish in their modes of expression."—*Works* ii. 259.

Specification v. ".Writers, who approximate so nearly to Rome,[1] in their views of the Sacraments, rival her, of course, in *their notions of Church power, and the authority of the Clergy.*"—The items charged under this specification are, teaching that a Church episcopally organized is the only way to eternal life; that it is the channel of grace; that its Sacraments are the means for the imparting of Gospel gifts; and that the Bishops, not only, but the Presbyters of such a Church, have power over the gifts of the Holy Ghost, and to some extent over the things of the unseen world: and these are specified, "to show how Papistical these writers are in their notions of the power of the priesthood." (p. 47.) Papistical, more or less, Richard Hooker, whom Mr. Boardman justly holds as high authority, had the same notions: and, what is even more awkward for the "Pastor of the Walnut street Presbyterian Church," they are taught —the Episcopacy, which makes the high claim valid, alone excepted—not only in the "Confession of Faith of the Reformed Dutch Church, revised in the national synod, held at Dordrecht, in the years 1618,and 1619;"

[1] "This is not Popery precisely, I grant," says Mr. Boardman, (p. 46.) Then why introduce it?

but in the "Confession of Faith" and "Form of Government" contained in "the Constitution of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America," as amended in 1833.

What saith "judicious Hooker?"

"In that they are Christ's ambassadors and His laborers, who should give them their commission, but He Whose most inward affairs they manage? Is not God alone the Father of spirits? Are not souls the purchase of Jesus Christ? What angel in heaven could have said to man, as our Lord did unto Peter, 'Feed my sheep, —preach—baptize—do this in remembrance of Me. Whose sins ye retain, they are retained; and their offences in heaven pardoned, whose faults you shall on earth forgive?' What think we? Are these terrestrial sounds, or else are they voices uttered out of the clouds above? The power of the ministry of God translateth out of darkness into glory; it raiseth man from the earth and bringeth God Himself from heaven; *by blessing visible elements it maketh them invisible graces; it giveth daily the Holy Ghost; it hath to dispose of that flesh which was given for the life of the world, and the Blood which was poured out to redeem souls; when it poureth maledictions upon the heads of the wicked, they perish; when it revoketh the same, they revive.* O wretched blindness, if we admire not so great power; more wretched if we consider it aright, and, notwithstanding, imagine that any but God can bestow it? To whom Christ hath imparted power, both over that mystical body which is the society of souls, and over that natural which is Himself, for the knitting of both in one (a work which Antiquity doth call the making of Christ's Body,) the same power is in such not amiss both termed a kind of mark or character, and acknowledged to be indelible. . . . . 'Receive the Holy Ghost; whose sins soever ye remit, they are remitted; whose sins ye retain, they are retained.' Whereas, therefore, the other Evangelists had set down, that Christ did, before His suffering, promise to give His Apostles the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and being risen from the dead, promised moreover at that time a miraculous power of the Holy Ghost, St. John addeth, that He also invested them, even then, with the power

of the Holy Ghost for castigation and relaxation of sin, wherein was fully accomplished that which the promise of the keys did import. Seeing, therefore, that the same power is now given, why should the same form of words expressing it be thought foolish?"—*Ecclesiastical Polity, Keble's edition*, v. lxxvii. 1, 2, 7.

What saith "the Reformed Dutch Church?"

ARTICLE xxvii. *Of the Catholic Christian Church.*—We believe and profess one Catholic or universal Church, which is an holy congregation of true Christian believers, all expecting their salvation in Jesus Christ, being washed by his blood, sanctified and sealed by the Holy Ghost. * * * *

ARTICLE xxv. *That every one is bound to join himself to the true Church.*—We believe since this holy congregation is an assembly of those who are saved, and that *out of it there is no salvation*, that no person, of whatsoever state or condition he may be, ought to withdraw himself, to live in a separate state from it; * * * * * all those who separate themselves from the same, or do not join themselves to it, act contrary to the ordinance of God.

ARTICLE xxx. *Concerning the government of, and officers in, the Church.*—We believe that this true Church must be governed by the spiritual polity which our Lord hath taught us in his word; namely, that *there must be ministers* or pastors to preach the word of God, and *to administer the sacraments.* * * * * *

ARTICLE xxxiii. *Of the Sacraments.*—We believe that our gracious God, on account of our weakness and infirmities, hath ordained the sacraments for us, thereby to seal unto us his promises, and to be pledges of the good will and grace of God toward us, and also *to nourish and strengthen our faith;* which he hath joined to the word of the Gospel, the better to present to our senses both that which he signifies to us by his word, and *that which he works inwardly in our hearts, thereby assuring and confirming in us the salvation which he imparts to us.* For they are visible signs and seals of an inward and invisible thing, *by means whereof, God worketh in us by the power of the Holy Ghost.* * * * * *

What saith "the Presbyterian Church?"

CONFESSION OF FAITH, chapter xxv. *Of the Church.* § 2. The

visible Church, which is also Catholic or universal under the Gospel, * * * * * is the kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ, the house and family of God, *out of which there is no ordinary possibility of salvation.*

§ 3. *Unto this Catholic Visible Church, Christ hath given the* ministry, oracles and *ordinances of God*, for the gathering and perfecting of the saints in this life, to the end of the world: *and doth by his own presence and Spirit*, according to his promise, *make them effectual thereunto.*

Church Government, Chapter iii. § 1. Our blessed Lord at first collected his Church out of different nations, and formed it into one body, by the mission of men endued with miraculous gifts, which have long since ceased.

§ 2. The ordinary and perpetual officers in the Church, are Bishops or Pastors; the representatives of the people, usually styled Rulers, Elders and Deacons.

Confession of Faith, Chapter xxx. *Of Church Censures.* § 2. *To these officers the keys of the kingdom of heaven are committed, by virtue whereof they have power respectively to retain and remit sins, to shut that kingdom* against the impenitent, both *by* the word and *censures; and to open it* unto penitent sinners, by the ministry of the Gospel, and *by absolution from censures*, as occasion shall require.

Chapter xxviii. *Of Baptism.* § 1. Baptism is a sacrament of the New Testament, ordained by Jesus Christ, not only for the solemn admission of the party baptized into the visible Church,[1] but also to be unto him *a sign and seal* of the covenant of grace, *of his ingrafting into Christ, of regeneration, of remission of sins,* * * * * *

Chapter xxix. *Of the Lord's Supper.* § 1. Our Lord Jesus, in the night wherein he was betrayed, instituted the sacrament of his body and blood, called the Lord's Supper, *to be observed in his Church, unto the end of the world; for* the perpetual remembrance of the sacrifice of himself in his death, the sealing all benefits thereof unto true believers, *their spiritual nourishment and growth in him.* * * * *

Chapter xxvii. *Of the Sacraments*, § 4. There be only two sa-

---

1 "Out of which there is no ordinary possibility of salvation." See above.

craments ordained by Christ our Lord in the Gospel, that is to say, Baptism and the Supper of the Lord; *neither of which may be dispensed by any, but by a minister lawfully ordained.*

"The only design with which I have introduced the above extracts"—Mr. Boardman will allow me the use of his own expressions—"is, to show how Papistical" the "Dutch Reformed Church" and the "Presbyterian Church" "are in their notions of the power of the priesthood." "I think impartial men will agree, that there is rank Popery in the doctrine here exhibited, however" the teachers of it "may refuse to acknowledge the Pope's supremacy." (p. 47.)

Specification vi. "*The doctrine of the Tracts on this vital point*," "*justifying righteousness*," "*is substantially that of Rome.*"—Notwithstanding "that the corner-stone of the Reformation," as Mr. Boardman understands it, "was laid on the doctrine, that the Papal Church is Anti-Christ," it is under cover of this specification that the strongest hopes are entertained of fixing Popery on Oxford. With how much justice, we are now to enquire.

The Oxford views on this subject are presented fully in what Dr. Pusey well describes, as a "very elaborate and meditative work, by one of those accused of departing from the articles." He alludes to "Lectures on Justification, by John Henry Newman, B. D., Fellow of Oriel College, and Vicar of St. Mary the Virgin's, Oxford." In his Letter to the Bishop of Oxford, quoted above, he occupies but eighteen pages with the subject; excusing himself from "lengthened detail upon it," by reference to Mr. Newman's book. To the *fourth* edition of this

Letter, there is a Preface of fifty-nine pages, devoted to this topic; still founded on Mr. Newman's book, and designed to assist the reader in mastering, what he calls, "its thoughtfulness." It comes up, of course, in Dr. Pusey's Scriptural "Views of Holy Baptism." Other than in this portion of them, it has no prominence in the Tracts for the Times. Mr. Newman's book, and Dr. Pusey's Preface, not having been reprinted, are, of course, but little known. There is reason to think, however, that whatever is or is not written, Mr. Boardman had made up his mind that Popery is taught at Oxford. "I am aware," he says, (p. 54,) "that in the face of numerous statements like those that have been cited, they *profess*" (the Italics are his own,) "to exclude sanctification from having any place in our justification, and they may fancy[1] that they really do this." And again, (p. 56.) "They" ("the Oxfordists," he calls them,) "have much to say about 'justification by faith'; and those who are governed more by sound than sense, might at first sight suppose that they really believe with your articles on this point; but this is far from being the case." One wonders which to admire most, the modesty or charity of this! But we must let that pass, and hasten to the question.

What is the Popish error in regard to justification? Is it taught at Oxford? The Popish error on this subject is variously stated by Mr. Boardman, (pp. 50, 51,) as justification "by being made inwardly

---

[1] An odd expression in theology: but quite a favorite with Mr. Boardman. See his p. 30, quoted in our 25.

and subjectively righteous;" confounding the gifts of "justification and sanctification;" making "sanctification or personal righteousness the ground of justification:" and, in connexion with these statements, he presents the inference, that "justification is progressive." Merely reminding the reader, in passing, that the first of the "irreconcileable differences with Rome," as stated in Tract 38, (quoted on our p. 27,) is in these explicit words, "I consider that IT IS UNSCRIPTURAL TO SAY, WITH THE CHURCH OF ROME, that WE ARE JUSTIFIED BY INHERENT RIGHTEOUSNESS;" let the Oxford teaching on this subject be presented (from the Preface to the fourth edition of the Letter to the Bishop of Oxford, which is the latest publication on the subject,) in the words of Dr. Pusey and of Mr. Newman.

i. "Justification is, as a cause, antecedent to sanctification, in which it issues."—*Pusey*, p. xxviii.

"First, justification is properly speaking, a *declaration* of righteousness; secondly, it *precedes* renewal; thirdly, it is the *means*, *instrument*, or *cause* of renewal."—*Newman*, p. 71.

ii. "Justification is a free pardon of us, when guilty, from God's mercy alone, irrespective of any thing in man."—Pusey, p. xxix.

"The doctrine of our justification not only implies, but derives its special force from our being by birth sinners, and culprits. It supposes a judicial process; that is an accuser, a judgment-seat, and a prisoner. Such is our condition by nature. The devil is our accuser." "Then, as St. Paul says, 'Every mouth is stopped, and all the world is guilty before God.' Under these circumstances, when there is no health or hope in us, when we hide our faces, and are speechless, the all-merciful God, as we are taught in the Gospel, for CHRIST'S sake, freely pardons and *justifies* us."—*Newman*, pp. 77, 78.

iii. "It is wholly from God."—*Pusey*, p. xxx.

"Justification is wholly the work of God; it comes from God to us; it is a power exerted on our souls by Him, as the healing of the Israelites was a power exerted on their bodies. The gift must be brought *near* to us; it is not, like the Brazen Serpent, a mere external material local sign; it is a spiritual gift, and so admits of being applied to us individually. Christ's cross does not justify, by being looked at, but by being applied; not by being gazed at in faith, but by being actually set up within us, and that not by our act, but God's invisible grace. Men sit, and gaze, and speak of the great atonement, and think this appropriating it. Men say that faith is an apprehending and applying; faith cannot really apply it; man cannot make the Saviour of the world his own; the cross must be brought home to us, not in word, but in power, and this is the work of the Spirit. This is justification; but when imparted to the soul, it draws blood, it heals, it purifies, it glorifies."[1]—*Newman*, p. 203.

iv. "Justification is perfect at once, renewal or sanctification gradual."—*Pusey*, p. xxx.

"He sanctifies us gradually; but justification is a perfect act, realizing at once what sanctification does but tend towards. In it the whole course of sanctification is anticipated, reckoned, or imputed to us in its very beginning. Before any man has done any thing as specimen, or paid any thing as instalment, he has the whole treasure of redemption put to his credit, as if he were and had done infinitely more than he ever can be or do."—*Newman*, p. 79.

viii. "Justification, though productive of renewal, is distinct from it, in idea."—*Pusey*, p. xxxii.

"If the justifying word be attended by the spiritual entrance of Christ into the soul, justification is perfectly distinct from renewal,

[1] This is the passage of which Mr. Boardman takes a part, not indicating any omission, and shews up one clause of it in small capitals; and asks, "what will plain readers of the Bible say to the following passage?" It will probably remind them of St. Paul, *Galatians* vi. 14. "God forbid that I should glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom the world is crucified unto me, and I unto the world:" and they will be very likely to say, that they wish Mr. Boardman had given them more of as good matter.

with which Romanists identify it; yet directly productive of it, which strict Protestants deny. The latter say that renewal is a collateral result with justification from faith; the former say that it precedes justification. Rather, Christ's sacred presence, which shines forth in the heart straight upon the word of justification, creates a renewal there, as certainly as a light involves illumination, or fire heat,"—*Newman*, pp. 170, 171.

ix. "Justification does not consist in renewal or sanctification, or any thing of our own."—*Pusey*, p. xxxii.

"Thus an examination of the promises made us in Scripture, bears out the conclusion we had already drawn on other grounds, that the righteousness, on which we are called righteous, or are justified, that in which justification results or consists, which conveys or applies the great gospel privileges, that this justifying principle, though *within* us, as it must be, if it is to separate us from the world, yet is not *of* us, or *in* us, not any quality or act of our minds, not faith, not renovation, not obedience, not any thing cognizable by man, but a certain *divine* gift in which all these qualifications are included."—*Newman*, p. 171.

Briefly thus:

Rome	Oxford
Teaches that we are justified by inherent righteousness;	Teaches that justification is a free pardon of us when guilty from God's laws alone, irrespective of any thing in man, ii;
Confounds justification with sanctification;	Distinguishes justification from renewal, viii;
Makes personal righteousness the ground of justification;	Makes justification not to consist in renewal or sanctification, or any thing of our own, ix;
Holds that justification is progressive.	Holds that justification is perfect at once, sanctification gradual, iv.

But, it is objected, Mr. Newman contradicts himself. What, for example, is the inference from these

sentences of his, which follow, but that in his system justification is confounded with sanctification?

"He," (Mr. Newman,) "says, 'justification and sanctification, are substantially the same thing;—parts of one gift; properties, qualities or aspects of one.' In another place, he maintains, 'their identity in matter of fact, however we may vary our terms, or classify our ideas.' "—p. 54.

Such are Mr. Boardman's statement and quotations, always without reference. The passage, from which these made-up sentences are violently torn, taken together, reads as follows. Whether his words are sustained, the reader is to judge. The parts which Mr. Boardman uses, we italicize.

"Now in the last lecture, in which I stated, what I considered as in the main, the true doctrine, two points were proposed for proof; first, that *justification and sanctification*, were *substantially the same thing;* next, that, viewed relatively to each other, justification followed upon sanctification. The former of these statements seems to me entirely borne out by scripture; I mean, that justification and sanctification are there described as *parts of one gift; properties, qualities, or aspects of one;* that RENEWAL CANNOT EXIST WITHOUT ACCEPTANCE, OR ACCEPTANCE WITHOUT RENEWAL; that Faith, which is the symbol of the one, contains in it Love, which is the symbol of the other. So much concerning the former of these statements; but as to the latter, that justification follows upon sanctification, that we are first renewed, and then and therefore accepted, this doctrine, which Luther strenuously opposed, is true in one sense, but not in another;—true in a popular sense, not true in an exact sense. Now, in the present lecture, I propose to consider the exact and philosophical relation of justification to sanctification, in regard to which Luther seems to be in the right; in the next Lecture, the popular and practical relation of the one to the other, which St. Austin, and other Fathers set forth: and in the sixth and following, what has partly been the subject of the foregoing Lecture, the real connexion between the two, or rather, *identity in matter of fact, however we may vary our terms, or classify our ideas.*"—*Newman*, pp. 67, 68.

Now the Lecture to which Mr. Newman here refers as "the last Lecture," is the same from which Mr. Boardman culled the sentences, which next precede those which we have just cited, from his 52d page. The passage, *taken in connexion*, will bring out his real meaning.

"It is usual, at the present day, to lay great stress on the distinction between deliverance from guilt and deliverance from sin; to lay down, as a first principle, that these are two co-incident, indeed, and contemporary, but altogether independent benefits, to call them justification and renewal, and to consider that any confusion between them argues serious and alarming ignorance of Christian truth. Now, in opposition to this, it may surely be maintained, that Scripture itself blends them together as intimately as any system of theology can do; and that such a system is not thereby dark and ignorant, unless Scripture is also. *In truth, Scripture speaks of but one gift, which it sometimes calls renewal, sometimes justification, according as it views it—passing to and fro, from one to the other, so rapidly, so abruptly, as to force upon us, irresistibly, the inference, that they are really one.* In other words, I would say that *this distinction*, so carefully made at present, *is not scriptural.*"—*Newman*, pp. 42, 43.

Into the extended illustration of this point from Scripture, the reader cannot now be led. A single sample may be furnished, from the 51st Psalm.

"That this is an evangelical psalm, in the fullest sense, no one can doubt. It is David's prayer for restoration to God's favour, after his grievous fall. It contains in it the two ideas in question, of deliverance from guilt, and deliverance from sin; but does it accurately distinguish between them?" "For instance, which benefit does he speak of when he says, '*Wash* me thoroughly from my wickedness, and *cleanse* me from my sin?' If we judge from a subsequent verse, 'Thou shalt purge me with hyssop, and I shall be clean,' we shall say he must mean renewal by 'washing;' but if so, observe how the foregoing verse connects with it—'Have mercy

upon me, O God—do away mine offences, wash me.'" "Again, 'Thou shalt *wash* me, and I shall be whiter than snow; thou shalt make me hear of *joy* and gladness.' What then? Does joy follow from sanctification? The popular doctrine at present connects it rigidly with justification; as if *immediately upon* justification, and *before* sanctification, 'joy and peace in believing' ensued. I really do not understand how a man can read this most important Psalm, without perceiving (though I know many do not perceive it) that we are forgiven *by being*, or *while we are* renewed; and that the present broad separation of justification and sanctification, as if they were two gifts, is technical and unscriptural."—*Newman*, pp. 43, 4.

Now it is by no means necessary to espouse these views, nor yet to be convinced by the reasonings, or the proofs from Scripture, on which the writer urges them. The present Brief Examination disavows, entirely, the question of adoption or rejection. And yet, is it not possible that theological statements, on this controverted subject, may have become technical, beyond the warrant of Scripture? Is it easy to draw, in the mere words of inspiration, the exact distinction between justification and sanctification? Is it the office of Holy Writ to be exact and logical? Are we not rather taught in it to choose the mean between what seem to be opposing propositions? As when St. Paul says, (Romans iii. 28) "Therefore we conclude that a man is justified by faith, without the deeds of the law;" and St. James, (ii. 24,) "Ye see, then, how that by works a man is justified, and not by faith only:" as when St. Paul says, (Philippians ii. 12, 13,) "Work out your own salvation, with fear and trembling; for it is God which worketh in you both to will, and to do, of his good pleasure:" as when Solomon says, (Proverbs xxvi. 4, 5,) "Answer not a fool

according to his folly;" and again, "Answer a fool according to his folly." Is it the object of the sacred writers to instruct us in the *rationale*, near so much as to constrain us, by the abounding grace, of the salvation which is by Christ Jesus? How does the sentence marked in small capitals, from Mr. Newman, (on our p. 67.) "renewal cannot exist without acceptance, or acceptance without renewal," exceed, or differ from, the expression of Mr. Boardman, that "justification and regeneration are inseparably associated; that is, that *all who are justified, are at the same time renewed and sanctified?*" And, when Mr. Boardman, in the same sentence, denies that "this personal holiness, which is communicated by the Holy Spirit, in regeneration, constitutes any part of that righteousness, on the ground of which the sinner is pardoned and accepted of God, *although*," as he admits above, "*inseparably associated*," however just the exception, is it not technical, more than Scriptural? And is it more than just to allow to Mr. Newman the full benefit of an explanatory statement, such as this which follows?

"Justification, then, viewed relatively to the past, is forgiveness of sin, for nothing more it can be; but, considered as to the present and future, it is more; it is renewal, wrought in us by the Spirit of Him, who, withal by his death and passion, washes away its still adhering imperfections, as well as blots out what is past. And faith is said to justify in two principal ways:—first, as continually pleading before God; and, secondly, as being the first recipient of the Spirit, the root, and, therefore, the earnest and anticipation, of perfect obedience."—*Newman*, p. 38.

Is there not warrant for such an explanation in the Articles; of which the twelfth, entitled "Of good

works," speaks of them as "fruits of faith," which follow after *justification;*" while the thirteenth, entitled "Of works *before justification*," describes them as "works done *before* the grace of Christ, and *the inspiration of his Spirit*"—as if the phrases in italics were convertible terms? And, finally, is not this the very distinction of the Catechism? "I heartily thank our heavenly Father, that *he hath called me to this state of salvation*, through Jesus Christ our Saviour; and I pray unto God to give me his grace, that I may *continue in the same* unto my life's end"—where the "state of salvation," viewed relatively to the past, is attained "through Jesus Christ our Saviour;" but, considered as present and future, is to be continued in, by God's "grace:" the state attained to, and the state continued in, being, "the same;" therefore, both a state of justification—though, in the latter, most undoubtedly, including the renewal of the Spirit? Surely, there is a claim, before the sentence be pronounced, to listen to these words of Dr. Pusey; words, like all he writes, of soberness, and piety. "With regard to those who dread lest sanctification should be unduly mixed up with justification, these difficulties appear to have arisen chiefly from confounding the *act* of justification with the *state* of justification, (or, as our Catechism expresses it, of 'salvation;') God's gracious act with our condition; God's 'justifying' with our 'being justified:' and again, our condition upon our first entrance into that state with our subsequent continuance. For these would obviously be distinct subjects of inquiry, and would require different answers, wherein justification

consisted, as God's act, (which is the remission of our sins;) and wherein our continuing to be justified consists, which is our being members of His Son, which we do remain through His Spirit dwelling in us." Letter, pp. xiii, xiv.

But it is time that Dr. Pusey and Mr. Newman should come up together again. They have been cited jointly, as declaring, 1. that justification as a cause is antecedent of sanctification; 2. that it is a free pardon of us when guilty, from God's mercy alone, irrespective of any thing in man; 3. that it is wholly the work of God; 4. that it is perfect at once, while renewal or sanctification is gradual; 5. that though productive of renewal, it is distinct from it; 6. that it does not consist in renewal or sanctification, or any thing of our own. They are now—still using their joint teaching, as in the Preface to the fourth edition of the Letter—to explain themselves still further.

x. "Our justification consists in our being members of Christ." *Pusey*, p. xxxiii.

"That our justification, or our being accounted righteous by Almighty God, consists in our being grafted into the Body, or made members of CHRIST, in GOD dwelling in us and our dwelling in GOD, and that the HOLY GHOST is the gracious agent in this wonderful work,—all this has been argued from Scripture in various ways." *Newman, p.* 233.

xiii. "The source of our acceptance is our union with CHRIST, and the FATHER looks upon us as acceptable, as being in Him." *Pusey*, p. xl.

"What, in truth, is the gift even in this our state of humiliation, but a grafting invisibly into the Body of CHRIST; a mysterious union

with Him, and a fellowship in all the grace and blessedness which is hidden in Him. Thus it separates us from other children of Adam, is our badge and distinction in the presence of the unseen world, and is the earnest of greater good in store. It is an angelic glory which good spirits honour, which devils tremble at, and which we are bound reverently to cherish, with a careful abstinence of sin, and with the sacrifice of good works. Well then may Prophets and Apostles exult in it, as the great gift of Divine mercy, as the rich garment of salvation, and the enjewelled robe of righteousness; as linen clean and white, or as it is elsewhere expressed, as 'CHRIST in us,' and 'upon us,' and around us; as if it were a light streaming from our hearts, pervading the whole man, enwrapping and hiding the lineaments and members of our fallen nature, circling around us, and returning inward to the centre from which it issues. The Almighty FATHER, looking on us, sees not us, but this sacred Presence, even His dearly beloved SON spiritually manifested in us; with His blood upon our door-posts, in earnest of that final abolition of sin which is at length to be accomplished in us."—*Newman*, pp. 183, 4.

"Just the reverse of this is the Romanist. His theory leads men as naturally to look chiefly to their works, and as it has a Pelagian *tendency* (although it has been held together with high Augustinian doctrine,) so may it readily lead them to look to their own works as their own; to weigh them, balance them, evil against good, make the one compensate for the other, settle their several values; at last, hold the Almighty their debtor, as if the more eminent saints had a supererogation of merits. 'It makes,' to use Mr. Newman's words, 'its heavenly grace a matter of purchase and trade.' 'Romanism,' as he again says, 'by its pretence of Infallibility, lowers the standard and quality of Gospel obedience, as well as impairs its myterious and sacred character; and this in various ways. When religion is reduced in all its parts to a system, there is hazard of something earthly being made the chief object of our contemplation, instead of our Maker. Now Romanism classifies our duties and their rewards, the things to do, the modes of pleasing God, the penalties and the remedies of sin, with such exactness, that an individual knows (so to speak) just where he is upon his journey heavenward, how far he is got, how much he has to pass, and his duties become a matter of

calculation. It provides us with a sort of graduated scale of devotion and obedience, and engrosses our thoughts with the details of a mere system, to a comparative forgetfulness of its professed Author. But it is evident that the purest religious services are those which are done, not by constraint, but voluntarily, as a free offering to Almighty God. True faith does not like to realize to itself what it does; it throws off the thought of it; it is carried on and reaches forward towards perfection, not counting the steps it has ascended, but keeping the end steadily in its eye, knowing only that it is advancing, and glorying in each sacrifice or service which it is allowed to offer, as it occurs, not remembering it afterwards. But in Romanism there would seem to be little room for this unconscious devotion. Each deed has its price, every quarter of the land of promise is laid down and described. Roads are carefully marked out, and such as would attain to perfection are constrained to move in certain lines, as if there were a science of gaining heaven. Thus the Saints are cut off from the Christian multitude by certain fixed duties, not rising out of it by the continuous growth, and flowing forth, of services which in their substance pertain to all men. And Christian holiness, in consequence, loses its freshness, vigour, and comeliness, being frozen, (as it were) into certain attitudes, which are not graceful except when unstudied.

"'The injury resulting to the multitude from the same circumstance, is of a different, but not less serious nature. While, of those who aim at the more perfect obedience, many are made self-satisfied, and still more formal, the mass of Christians are either discouraged from attempting or countenanced in neglecting it. If, indeed, there is one offence more than the rest characteristic of Romanism, it is this, its indulging the carnal tastes of the multitude of men, setting a limit to their necessary obedience, and absolving them from the duty of sacrificing their whole lives to God.'

"The Anglican doctrine directs men to look neither to their faith nor their works, but to Christ alone, 'the Author and Finisher of their faith,' not staying to analyze their feelings, nor weighing their works in a balance, as if claiming heaven either by faith or works, but looking simply to Him, striving to follow Him, to do as He bids; to act as He guides; to look off from things behind, to press forward

to things before, as having Him ever before our eyes, whose goodness and greatness, and holiness, and glory, are immmeasurable, yet who bade us follow in His steps, and 'in whom instrengthening' (ἐνδυναμοῦντι), because indwelling, St. Paul could do all things;" "Who is our righteousness, by dwelling in us by the Spirit; justifies us by entering into us; continues to justify us by remaining in us. This is really and truly our justification, not faith, not holiness, [with the Romanist] not (much less) a mere imputation [with the Lutheran] but through God's mercy, the very presence of Christ.'"—*Pusey*, pp. 75, 78.

"O great and noble system, not of the Jews, who rested in their rites and privileges, not of Christians who are taken up with their own feelings, and who describe what they should exhibit, but of the true saints of God, the undefiled and virgin souls, who follow the Lamb whithersoever he goeth? Such is the difference between those whom Christ praises, and those whom He condemns or warns. The Pharisee recounted the signs of God's mercy upon and in him; the Publican simply looked to God. The young ruler boasted of his correct life, but the penitent woman anointed Jesus' feet and kissed them; nay, holy Martha herself spoke of her 'much service;' while Mary waited on Him for the 'one thing needful.' The one thought of themselves; the others thought of Christ. To look at Christ is to be justified by faith; to think of being justified by faith is to look from Christ and to fall from grace."[1]—*Newman*, pp. 80, 81.

---

[1] "True faith," observes Mr. Newman, "is what may be called colourless, like air or water; it is but the medium through which the soul sees Christ; and the soul as little really rests upon it, and contemplates it, as the eye can see the air. When, then, men are bent on holding it, (as it were) in their hands, curiously inspecting, analyzing, and so aiming at it, they are obliged to colour and thicken it, that it may be seen and touched. That is, they substitute for it something or other, a feeling, notion, sentiment, conviction, or act of reason, which they may hang over and dote upon. They rather aim at experiences (as they are called) within them, than at Him that is without them. They are led to enlarge upon the signs of conversion, the variations of their feelings, their aspirations and longings, and to tell all this to others;—to tell others how they fear, and hope, and sin, and rejoice, and renounce themselves, and rest in Christ only; how conscious they are that they are but 'filthy rags,' and all is of grace, till in fact they have little time left them to guard against what they are condemning, and to exercise what they seem to themselves to be so full of."—p. 385

It surely cannot be required, to pursue, at any greater length, the charge alleged against the Oxford writers, that they teach the Popish error of justification, by inherent righteousness; a justification which allows of merit in good works. To take a clause of a sentence here, and another there, and join them; to insert explanatory words;[1] to leave the middle of a sentence out:[2] there being not the slightest indication of these freedoms, but the passages all marked, as literal quotations,—nay, to extort a meaning from the 100th page of a book,[3] and then, to extort

---

[1] "The gift of righteousness, (for justification) is not an imputation, but an inward work."—*Newman, as quoted by Boardman*, 53. "From first to last what the Psalmist longs after, and Prophets promise, and Apostles announce as given by Almighty God, is one and the same, the capacity of serving God acceptably, or *the gift of righteousness*, not a shadow, but a substance, not a name, but a power, *not an imputation, but an inward work*."—*Newman, as he is*, 39.

[2] "Cleanness of heart and spirit, obedience by word and deed, this alone can constitute our justification." *Newman, as quoted by Boardman*, 53.—"*Cleanness of heart and spirit, obedience by word and deed, this alone* in us can be acceptable to God; that is, this alone *can constitute our justification*."—*Newman, as he is*, 34. 5.

[3] "This indwelling righteousness, it seems, has even a satisfying and justifying quality in it, since he calls it, 'the justification for our sins in God's sight.'"—*Newman, as quoted by Boardman*, 53.—"Not that we are able to please Him simply and entirely, (for 'in many things we offend all;' and 'if we say we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us,') but that the presence of the Spirit is a sanctifying virtue in our hearts, changing the character of our services, making our obedience new in kind, not merely fuller in degree; and in this sense a *satisfying* obedience, rising up, answering to the *kind* of obedience which is due from us, to the *nature* of the claims which our Creator, Redeemer, and Sanctifier has upon us."—*Newman, as he is*, 100. With which connect what follows: "the inherent righteousness of a true Christian, viewed as distinct from Christ's inward presence, is something real, and doubtless far higher than that of a Jew; but why should we so degrade ourselves, so disparage our own high privilege, as to view it separately, to disjoin it from Him through whom we do it, to linger in the thought of it instead of tracing it back, to that which is its immediate source; as if a man were to praise the day-

another meaning from the 231st page, (the latter extortion marked as a quotation,) and to join the two together as one sentence,—such things may occasion temporary distrust; and may, from the entire absence of every reference, and from the necessity which they involve of large quotations, be perplexing to detect, and to expose: but they must recoil at last, and serve the cause, they were designed to hinder. With two extracts from Dr. Pusey, this portion of the subject may be well dismissed.

"All, indeed, are agreed on the one side, that the only intrinsically *meritorious* cause of our salvation is the atoning death of our redeeming Lord, embraced by faith; all, but the extreme Antinomian, that good works are essential to salvation; all, that every thing we are and have, our justification and sanctification, are the free gifts of God, not for our worthiness but effacing our unworthiness; all, that justification and sanctification are inseparable in act, that none can be justified without being sanctified, nor remain in a state of justification any longer than he continues to be sanctified; all, that the sanctification of God's great saints continues to be imperfect in this life, and that they have even to the end, need of the prayer, which the Lord taught us, 'Forgive us our trespasses,' as well for their actual and present daily short-comings and infirmities, as for their past offences; and so, that, superadded to sanctification, purifying us within, there is need of continual remission, cleansing us from without; that while God sanctifies the living members of his Son, and *makes* them more and more righteous, He also by remitting sin, for Christ's sake, accounts them righteous, *in so far* as they are not so; all, that the best are but 'unprofitable servants;' all, that even God's best servants have need of His merciful judgment; all, that He will

---

light, yet forget the sun? No, whatever might be the righteousness of the Jews, we certainly know what is ours, and it is what they could not have had; it is 'Christ;' our *propitiation*, 'within us;' on it we rely, not on ourselves." 230, 1.—I am ashamed to point out these passages, as intended by Mr. Boardman's last cited sentence. But I have looked twice through Mr. Newman's 450 pages—Mr. Boardman gives no references—to find what he marks as a quotation, and there is nothing else so near!

bestow a different crown upon each in proportion to their faithfulness; all, that this crown is His gift, (grace rewarding upon grace sanctifying,) not their desert; all, that although sanctification be necessary for our ultimate acceptance, yet to the end we may and must look, over and above, to God's mercy in Christ; all, that our hope of salvation rests not upon our sanctification, without an accompanying act of God's mercy, forgiving our trespasses."—*Letter*, pp vii, viii.

"It would then be an unwarrantable misrepresentation, if any one should continue to speak of the view of justification here taken, as any ways trenching upon the free mercy of God in Christ; in Him it begins, it ends in Him; begins in Him as the source whence it flows, the only meritorious cause of our acceptance; by Him it is sustained, rendering well-pleasing to Him, through His indwelling Spirit, those whom he has made members of Himself; in Him it ends, pardoning, for the sake of the precious bloodshedding, 'the sins, which,' notwithstanding that sanctifying presence, 'we, by our frailty, have committed.' There is then, no question about the meritorious cause of our acceptance, the atoning blood; none, whether, we be not at first justified without works; none, about the source of all good works, the indwelling grace of Christ, preventing, helping, perfecting; none, whether the works, so wrought can, in themselves, sustain the righteous judgment of God; none, whether to the end, there be not need of the continual sprinkling of the blood of Christ, making, acceptable our offerings, and cleansing our pollutions; none, whether all sin deserve not God's wrath, and be not pardoned for the sake of that blood alone; or, in whatever other way it could be said, that in all things God is to us the beginning and the end; the First and the Last; the Author and Finisher of our faith."—*Letter*, pp. xl, xli.

But much as, by the copious extracts given, our discussion of the subject has already gone beyond the reasonable limits of a Brief Examination, it may not yet be left. The Oxford writers are not only charged as Popish, for teaching that men are justified by their inherent righteousness; but for the prominence assigned by them to Baptism, in the scheme of man's salvation. As the reply to the first charge is the denial that it is Oxford teaching; the defence against

the second charge is, that, though taught at Oxford, it is far from Popish. The sentence following will state, as well as any, the matter in dispute. "According to our Church," says Dr. Pusey, "we are by Baptism brought into a state of salvation or justification, (for the words are, thus far, equivalent,) a state into which we were brought, of God's free mercy alone, without works, but in which, having been placed, we are to 'work out our own salvation, with fear and trembling,' through the indwelling Spirit of 'God, working in us, to will, and to do, of his good pleasure;' "[1]—*Letter*, p. 82. This is charged as Popish teaching. "Dr. Pusey," says Mr. Boardman, (p. 61,) "earnestly maintains that by baptism an individual receives 'the forgiveness of sin, and a new nature,' and is 'made a *real* child of God, and a real member of Christ, not simply an outward member of

[1] This sentence receives strange treatment at the hands of Mr. Boardman. He had made several quotations, on page 53. "The above extracts," he says, "are from Mr. Newman's work on Justification." (One or two of them, though probably Mr. Boardman does not know it, are from Dr. Pusey's Letter.) "That they involve the idea of a *progressive* justification, must be apparent to every one; but we are not left to gather this inferentially. Dr. Pusey, in his Letter to the Bishop of Oxford, says, 'we are by baptism brought into a state of salvation or justification (for the words are thus far equivalent,) * * * * * a *state admitting of degrees according to the degree of sanctification*." In which quotation, * * * * stands in the place of—"a state into which we were brought of God's free mercy alone, without works, but in which having been placed, we are to 'work out our own salvation, with fear and trembling,' through the indwelling Spirit of God, working in us to will and to do of His good pleasure." —Then, the words which follow the omission are not only *itailcised*, to give them a false prominence; but, by a period, and the quotation marks, are made to appear as the end of the sentence; thus, omitting entirely the important parenthesis which follows them ("although the first *act*, whereby we were brought into it did not",) that is, *did not admit of degrees*. In plain English, he makes Dr. Pusey say precisely what he did not say.

an outward body of people called Christians.' This sounds very Popish to Protestant ears." And yet, Peter taught it—"Repent, and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." (Acts ii. 38.) It is what Ananias was sent of God, to say to Paul,—"And now why tarriest thou? Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord." (Acts xxii. 16.) It is what Paul constantly taught—"According to his mercy he saved us by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost;" (Titus iii. 5,) and again—"As many of you as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ;" (Galatians iii. 27,) and again—"By one Spirit we are all baptized into one body." (1 Corinthians xii. 13.) Nay, it is the very teaching of our blessed Lord himself—"Verily, verily, I say unto you, except a man be born of water, and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God;" (John iii. 5,) and again—"He that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved." (Mark xvi. 16.)

So it was understood by Archbishop Cranmer.

"And the second birth is by the water of Baptism, which Paul calleth the bath of regeneration, *because our sins be forgiven us in Baptism, and the Holy Ghost is poured into us as into God's beloved children, so that by the power and working of the Holy Ghost we be born again spiritually, and made new creatures.* And so by Baptism we enter into the kingdom of God, and are saved for ever, if we continue to our lives' end in the faith of Christ."—*Of Baptism*, (Tracts of the Anglican Fathers) *p.* 1.

And again;

"When we are born again by Baptism, then our sins are forgiven

us, and the Holy Ghost is given us, which doth make us also holy, and doth move us to all goodness."—*p.* 7.

And again;

"Therefore, consider, good children, the great treasures and benefits whereof God maketh us partakers when we are baptized, which be these. The first is, that in Baptism our sins be forgiven us, as Saint Peter witnesseth, saying, 'Let every one of you be baptized for the forgiveness of his sins.' The second is, that the Holy Ghost is given us, the which doth spread abroad the love of God in our hearts, whereby we may keep God's commandments according to this saying of St. Peter, 'Let every one of you be baptized in the name of Christ, and then you shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost.' The third is, that by Baptism *the whole righteousness of Christ is given* unto us, that we may claim the same as our own. For so Saint Paul teacheth, saying, 'As many of ye as are baptized in Christ have put upon you Christ.'" *p.* 8.

And again;

"But peradventure some will say, how can water work such great things? To whom I answer, that it is not the water that doeth these things, but the almighty word of God (which is knit and joined to the water) and faith which receiveth God's word and promise. For without the word of God, water is water, and not Baptism. But when the word of the living God is added and joined to the water, then it is the bath of regeneration, and baptism-water, and the lively spring of eternal salvation, and a bath that washeth our souls by the Holy Ghost, as Saint Paul calleth it, saying, 'God has saved us through his mercy, by the bath of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost, whom he hath poured upon us plenteously by Jesus Christ our Saviour, that we, *being made righteous* by his grace, may be heirs of everlasting life.' This is a sure and true word."—*pp.* 11, 12.

And again;

"And when you shall be asked, 'What availeth Baptism? you shall answer, Baptism worketh forgiveness of sin, it delivereth from the kingdom of the devil and from death, and giveth life and ever-

lasting salvation to all them that believe these words of Christ, and promise of God, which are written in the last chapter of Saint Mark, his Gospel, 'He that will believe and be baptized shall be saved, but he that will not believe shall be damned.' "—*p.* 13.

And again;

"But *after that our sins in Baptism be forgiven us, and we believe the promise of God, and so by our faith be justified,* then our consciences be quieted, and we be glad and merry, trusting assuredly that God is no more angry with us for our former offences, and that we shall not be damned for the same." *p.* 9.

And again;

"The wonderful work of God is not in the water, which only washeth the body, but *God, by his omnipotent power, worketh wonderfully in the receivers thereof, scouring, washing and making them clean inwardly, and, as it were, new men, and celestial creatures.*"—Answer to Gardiner,[1] Fol. 1551, p. 74.

And again;

"As in Baptism we must think that, as the Priest putteth his hand to the child outwardly and washeth him with water, so must we think that *God putteth to His hand inwardly, and washeth the infant with His Holy Spirit;* and moreover that *Christ himself cometh down upon the child, and apparelleth him with His own self.*" —Ibid, 444.

And again;

"Learn these things diligently, and thank God, who, in Christ, hath called you to be partakers of so large and ample benefits. And express Baptism in your life, and Baptism shall be the greatest comfort to you, both in your life time, and also in your death bed. For *by Baptism we be grafted into the death of Christ, wherefore sin, death or hell, cannot hurt us,* but we shall overcome all these things by faith, as Christ himself overcame them. And so *by this new birth we shall enter into the kingdom of God and life everlasting.* The which God grant us all. Amen."—*Of Baptism, p.* 14.

---

[1] Cranmer's latest work, so that this is, as it were, his dying testimony.

So it was understood by Bishop Hooper;

"Baptism is an outward washing done with water, thereby signifying *an inward washing of the Holy Ghost, wrought through the blood of Christ.*—Articles upon the Creed, lix. edit. 1583.

And again;

"I believe, also, that Baptism is the entry of the Church, *a washing into a new birth, and a renewing of the Holy Ghost*, whereby we do forsake ourselves, the devil, the flesh, sin, and the world.

For being once rid of the old man, with all his concupiscences, *we are clothed with the new man which is in Jesus Christ, in righteousness and holiness*, and with Him we die and are buried in his death, to the end that with Christ we may rise from death to the glory of the Father. And even likewise, *being thus new born*, we should walk in newness of life."—*Ibid.*

So it was understood by Dr. Lancelot Ridley;

"Here (Ephesians v. 26,) is shewed how Christ hath purged his church truly in the fountain of water, by his word, although God of his mere mercy and goodness, without all man's deserts or merits, only for Christ's sake hath washed and purged man from sin; yet *He useth a mean, by the which he cleanseth man from sin, which is Baptism, in water, by the word of God;* and so *in Baptism are our sins taken away, and we from sin purged, cleansed, and regenerated in a new man*, to live an holy life, according to the Spirit and will of God. It is not the water that washes us from sin, but Christ, by His word and His Spirit, given to us in Baptism, that washes away our sins, that we have of Adam, by carnal nature."—*Commentary on the Ephesians*, in Richmond's Fathers of the English Church, ii.

And again;

"Except a man be born again, of the Holy Ghost and of water he cannot enter the kingdom of heaven. To be born again of the Holy Ghost and of water, is to be christened, as Paul sheweth to Titus (iii) when *Baptism is called the fountain of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost.* Children, therefore, must be christened, if they shall enter the kindom of heaven, and be partakers of life celestial."—*Ibid.*

So it was understood by Bishop Jewel;

"St. Chrysostom saith, 'Plain or bare water worketh not in us; but when it hath received the grace of the Holy Ghost, *it washeth away our sins.*' So saith St. Ambrose also, 'The Holy Ghost cometh down and halloweth the water;' and 'There is the presence of the Trinity.' So saith St. Cyril, 'as water thoroughly heated with fire, burneth as well as the fire, so the waters that wash the body of him that is baptized are changed into Divine Power by the working of the Holy Ghost.' So saith St. Leo, sometime Bishop of Rome, 'Christ hath given like pre-eminence to the water of Baptism, as He gave to His mother, for that Power of the Highest, and that overshadowing of the Holy Ghost, which brought to pass that Mary should bring forth the Saviour of the world, hath also brought to pass that *the water should bear anew, or regenerate him that believeth.*' Such opinion had the ancient learned Fathers and such reverend words they used when they entreated of the sacraments. For it is not man, but God which worketh by them."—*Of Sacraments*, (Tracts of the Anglican Fathers,) pp. 72.

And again;

"Christ, saith the Apostle, 'loved the Church, and gave Himself for it, that He might sanctify and cleanse it, by the washing of water through the word.' Again, 'according to His mercy He saved us, by the washing of the new birth, and the renewing of the Holy Ghost.' For this cause is *Baptism called salvation, life, regeneration, and forgiveness of sins, the power of God to resurrection,* the image and pledge of the resurrection, and the word of immortality."—p. 78.

And again;

"Such a change is made in the sacrament of Baptism; through the power of God's working, the water is turned into blood; *they that be washed in it, receive the remission of sins; their robes are made clean in the blood of the Lamb.* The water itself is nothing; but by the working of God's Spirit, *the death and merits of our Lord and Saviour Christ, are thereby assured unto us.*"—p. 80.

And again;

"And this much of the sacrament of Baptism, which is the badge and cognizance of every Christian. *If any be not baptized,* but

lacketh the mark of God's fold, *we cannot discern him to be one of the flock;* if any take not the seal of regeneration, *we cannot say he is born the child of God.*[1] This is the ordinary way; let us use it, let us not despise, nor be slow to receive the sacraments; they are the means by which God maketh sure his good will towards us."—p. 83.

Such is the teaching of the Homilies;

"Insomuch that infants, *being baptized*, and dying in their infancy, *are by this sacrifice washed from their sins, brought to God's favour* and *made His children and inheritors of His kingdom of heaven.* And they which in act or deed do sin after their Baptism; when they turn again to God unfeignedly, they are likewise washed by this sacrifice from their sins, in such sort that there remaineth not any spot of sin, that shall be imputed to their damnation." —*First part af the Sermon of Salvation*, Oxford, 1832, pp. 25, 26.

And again;

"We must trust only in God's mercy, and that sacrifice which our High Priest and Saviour Christ Jesus, the Son of God once offered for us upon the cross, to obtain thereby God's grace and *remission as well of our original sin in baptism, as of all actual sin*, committed by us after baptism, if we truly repent, and turn unfeignedly to him again."—*Second part of the same*, p. 31.

And again;

"Our office is not to pass the time of this present life unfruitfully

---

[1] How keenly such reproof as this of Mr. Boardman must have fallen, had they lived to see the day, on Cranmer, Ridley, Hooper, Jewel! "One would think to hear them talk, that the New Testament must be a treatise on baptism—that baptism was the main topic of our Saviour's discourses, and the grand theme of Apostolic preaching—and that the great business of the minister is, not to preach the Gospel, but to administer the ordinances."(p. 59.) It seems trifling to remind Mr. Boardman that one precept of Christ is as good authority as one hundred; that we do not measure the importance of any truth or duty, by the frequency with which it is enjoined in holy scripture; that yet the last words of Jesus upon earth, were the commission to the Apostles, "Go ye and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them," and the first direction of the Apostles, after the Holy Ghost had come on them, "Repent and be baptized every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins."

and idly, after that we are *baptized or justified*, not caring how few good works we do, to the glory of God, and profit of our neighbours: much less is it our office, after that we be once made Christ's members, to live contrary to the same."—*Third part*, p. 34.

And again;

"We be therefore *washed in our baptism from the filthiness of sin*, that we should live afterward in the pureness of life."—*Sermon of the Passion*, p. 377.

Such is the teaching of the Articles;

"Sacraments ordained of Christ be not only badges or tokens of Christian men's profession; but rather they be certain sure witnesses and *effectual signs of grace* and God's good will towards, *by the which he doth work invisibly in us*, and doth not only quicken, but also strengthen and confirm our faith in him."—xxv.

And again;

"Baptism is not only a sign of profession and mark of difference, whereby Christian men are discerned from others that be not christened: but it is also *a sign of regeneration, or new birth, whereby, as by an instrument, they that receive baptism rightly are grafted into the Church: the promises of forgiveness of sin, and of our adoption to be the sons of God by the Holy Ghost are visibly signed and sealed: faith is confirmed and grace renewed*, by virtue of prayer unto God."—xxvii.

Such is the teaching of the Catechism;

Question. "Who gave you this name?

Answer. My Sponsors in *Baptism, wherein I was made a member of Christ, the child of God*, and an inheritor of the kingdom of Heaven.

* * * * * * *

Q. Dost thou not think that thou art bound to believe and to do, as they have promised for thee?

A. Yes, verily; and by God's help so I will, and I heartily thank our heavenly Father, that *he hath called me to this state of salvation*, through Jesus Christ our Saviour: and I pray unto God to

give me his grace that *I may continue in the same*, unto my life's end.

* * * * * * * * * *

Q. What is the inward and spiritual grace? (of baptism).

A. *A death unto sin*, and *a new birth unto righteousness*; for being by nature born in sin, and the children of wrath, *we are hereby made the children of grace.*"

Such is the teaching of the Liturgy;

"Almighty and everlasting God * * * * who didst sanctify the element of water to the mystical washing away of sin; we beseech thee, for thine infinite mercies, that thou wilt mercifully look upon these thy servants; *wash them, and sanctify them with the Holy Ghost;* that they, being delivered from thy wrath," * * * * *—*Ministration of Baptism to such as are of riper years.*

* * * * * we call upon thee for these persons that they coming to thy holy Baptism, *may receive remission of their sins, by spiritual regeneration* * * * * —*Ibid.*

* * * * * Doubt ye not therefore, but earnestly believe, that he will favourably receive these present persons, truly repenting and coming unto him by faith; that he will *grant them remission of their sins, and bestow upon them the Holy Ghost;* that he will give them the blessing of eternal life, and make them partakers of his everlasting kingdom."—*Ibid.*

* * * * * *Give thy Holy Spirit* to these persons; that they may *be born again*, and be made heirs of everlasting salvation, through our Lord Jesus Christ, * * * *—*Ibid.*

Seeing now, dearly beloved brethren, that these persons are *regenerate* and *grafted into the body of Christ's Church*, * * * *—*Ibid.*

* * * * * * * * * * * * Give thy Holy Spirit to these persons; that being now *born again, and made heirs of everlasting salvation*, through our Lord Jesus Christ, they may *continue* thy servants, and attain thy promises," * * * *—*Ibid.*

Nay, such is the teaching of "the Reformed Dutch Church;"

* * * * * * "As water washeth away the filth of the body,

when poured upon it, and is seen on the body of the baptized, when sprinkled upon him; *so doth the blood of Christ, by the power of the Holy Ghost, internally sprinkle the soul, cleanse it from its sins, and regenerate us from children of wrath unto children of God.* Not that this is effected by the external water, but by the sprinkling of the precious blood of the Son of God, who is our Red Sea, through which we must pass, to escape the tyranny of Pharaoh, that is, the devil, and to enter into the spiritual land of Canaan. Therefore the ministers on their part administer the sacrament, and that which is visible, *but our Lord giveth* that which is signified by the sacrament, namely, the *gifts, and invisible grace; washing, cleansing, and purging our souls of all filth and unrighteousness; renewing our hearts*, and filling them with all comfort, *giving unto us a true assurance of his fatherly goodness; putting on the new man*, and putting off the old man with all his deeds."—*Confession of Faith*, article xxxiv.

Nay—will Mr. Boardman believe it?—such is the teaching of the Presbyterian Church;

"Baptism is a sacrament of the New Testament, ordained by Jesus Christ, *not only for* the solemn *admission* of the party baptized *into the visible Church, but also* to be unto him *a sign and seal of the covenant of grace*, of his ingrafting into Christ, of *regeneration*, of *remission of sins*, and of his giving up unto God through Jesus Christ, to walk unto newness of life: * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * "By the right use of this ordinance the grace promised is not only offered, but *really exhibited and conferred by the Holy Ghost* to such (whether of age or infants) as that grace belongeth unto, according to the council of God's own will, in his appointed time."—*Confession of Faith*, chap. xxviii §§ 1, 6.

Will Mr. Boardman still say, "this sounds very Popish to Protestant ears?" (p. 61.)

And now, what is it that Mr. Newman does teach, on the subject of justification? Let him answer for himself!

"The point is this: that neither the imputed righteousness of

Christ, nor imparted, or inherent righteousness, is the constituting or formal cause of justification, or *that in which a justified state consists;* but a gift which includes both of them, and is greater than either; viz. the actual Presence, in a mysterious way, or indwelling in the soul, through the Spirit, of the Word incarnate, in whom is the Father."[1] *Newman*, p. 172.

And again:

"In the foregoing Lectures a view has been taken, substantially the same as this, but approaching more nearly in language to the Calvinists; viz. that CHRIST INDWELLING IS OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS; only what is with them a matter of words I would wish to use in a real sense, as expressing a sacred mystery; and therefore I have spoken of it, in the language of Scripture, as *the indwelling of Christ through the Spirit.* Stronger language cannot be desired than that which the Calvinists use on the subject; so much so that it may well be believed that many who use it, as the great Hooker himself, at the time he wrote his Treatise, meant what they say. For instance, the words of a celebrated passage which occurs in it, taken literally, do most entirely express the doctrine on the subject which seems to me the Scriptural and Catholic view. 'Christ hath merited righteousness for as many as are found in Him. In Him God findeth us, if we be faithful; for by faith we are incorporated into Christ. Then, although in ourselves we be altogether sinful and unrighteous, yet even the man which is impious in himself, full of iniquity, full of sin, him being found in Christ through faith, and having his sin remitted through repentance, him God beholdeth with a gracious eye, putteth away his sin by not imputing it, taketh quite away the punishment due thereto by pardoning it, and accepteth him in Jesus Christ, as perfectly righteous, as if he had fulfilled all that was commanded him in the Law; shall I say more perfectly righteous than if himself had fulfilled the whole Law?' I must take heed what I say; but the Apostle saith, God made Him which knew no sin, to be sin for us; that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him. Such we are in the sight of God the Father, as is the very Son of

[1] In connection with this, Mr. Newman quotes largely from the Homily on the Resurrection, as sustaining this view.

God himself. Let it be counted folly, or phrensy, or fury, or whatsoever, it is our comfort and our wisdom; we care for no knowledge in the world but this, that man hath sinned, and God hath suffered; that God hath made himself the sin of man, and that men are made the righteousness of God.'"[1] *Newman*, pp. 43, 25.

Can words be used farther from that which Hooker states to be the essence of the Romish error? "Then what is the fault of the Church of Rome? Not that she requireth works at their hands that will be saved: but that *she attributeth unto works the power of satisfying God for sin; and a virtue to merit both grace here, and in heaven glory.*"[2] Can there be more explicit reference of all to God? of all to grace? How clearly is it taught, that all we are or have, that ventures to present itself before the Holy One, is *through*, not only, *by*, and *of*, but—more endearing far—*in* Christ; "ACCEPTED," if acceptable, "IN THE BELOVED:" nay, yet more intimate, and more endearing, "we in Him, and HE IN US!"

How this mystical incorporation of the believer with "the Beloved" takes place, and is maintained, let Cranmer teach us, almost in Jesus Christ's own words.

"Our Lord Jesus Christ, good children, in the xv. chapter of John, speaketh thus: 'I am the true Vine, and my Father is the Husbandman. Every branch that beareth not fruit in Me, He will take away. And every branch that beareth fruit, He will prune, that it may bring forth more fruit. Now are ye clean, through the words which I have spoken unto you. Dwell in me, and I will dwell in you. As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself, except it grow in the vine, no more can ye except ye abide in me. I am the Vine, ye are the branches. He that abideth in me, and I in him, bringeth forth

[1] Keble's edition, iii. p. 610. [2] Ibid. iii. 661.

much fruit. For without me ye can do nothing.' By these words, our Lord Jesus Christ doth teach us very plainly how we be justified and saved before God. For as the branch of a vine bringeth forth no fruit except it abide in the vine, so we cannot be righteous except we abide in Christ. And as the branch of a vine doth not flourish, nor keep long his sap, but withereth away, and is cast into the fire when it is cut from the vine, even so we be damned and cannot be saved, when we forsake our Master Christ. Now ye have heard, good children, how by Baptism we are so planted in Christ, that, by Him, we have forgiveness of our sins, and are grafted in Him as the branch is in the vine. And as the branches have sap and life of the vine, that they may bring forth fruit, so we also (which believe in Christ, and are baptized) have received of Him the Holy Ghost, that we may be justified. * * * * Seeing our Saviour Christ doth give us His Body to be our meat, and His Blood to be our drink, and thereby doth declare that He will effectually dwell in us, strengthen, and preserve us to everlasting life, we may steadfastly believe that Christ doth work in us, and that He will give us ghostly strength and steadfastness, that we, like green branches, may continue in the Vine, and so be full of sap, and bring forth good fruit."—*Of the Lord's Supper*, (Tracts of the Anglican Fathers) 35, 42.

How close, and dear, and living, and effectual, is this union of the believer with the "Beloved," is well expressed by South.

"It (faith) gives them a real union with Christ; concerning which we must know, that as the union of the soul to the body is the cause of life natural, so the union of Christ to the soul is the fountain of life spiritual. Christ being to the soul like armour, he then only defends it when he is close united to it. And that such a nearness to him will afford us such protection from him, is evident from the nature of those things by which this union between him and believers is expressed. In John xv. 1, 2, Christ compares himself to the Vine, and believers to the branches. And in Colossians i. 18, he is compared to the Head, and believers to the members. Where we see that as long as the branch continues united to the vine, it receives both life and sap from it, whereby it is enabled to fructify and flour-

ish; and so long as the members preserve their conjunction with the head, they derive from thence Spirit and motion, whereby they are enabled to preserve themselves. But let there be a separation or disjunction between either of these, and then presently the branch withers and dies, and the members putrify and rot, and at length pass into a total corruption. And just so it is with Christ and believers; through him strengthening them, they can do all things; and on the other side, without him they can do nothing. It is from his fulness that life and strength flows in upon every part of his mystical body. And as our union to him is the great conduit by which all this is conveyed to us, so faith is the cause of this union. Faith ties the conjugal knot, and is that uniting principle, that, like a great nerve or string, fastens us to our spiritual Head, and so makes us partake of all its enlivening and supporting influences."—*Sermons*, v. 316.

Will any one still say that, on the subject of justification, Oxford teaches after Rome? Can any one confound the doctrine, that "CHRIST INDWELLING is our righteousness," with that which attributeth, as Hooker saith, to human works, "a virtue to merit both grace here, and in heaven glory?" Can language be employed more perfect in its efficiency, to humble the sinner, to exalt the Saviour, to refer every thing to mercy, to make Christ THE ALL IN ALL, and yet, to stimulate to utmost effort, to be holy as He is holy, perfect as He is perfect—"an habitation of God, through the Spirit?" Yet this is Oxford teaching.

SPECIFICATION VII. 'The views of the Tractists respecting *sin committed after Baptism*."—The reader will remember, that the charge is, that the Oxford writers teach "some of the worst errors of Popery;" and that it is on that point only, that issue now is joined. He will be surprised then to learn, that while, in one sentence, the shocking doubt, "whether

any provision has been made, in the glorious plan of redemption, for the remission of post-baptismal sins," is arrayed against them; the next but two or three contains the information, that "*the Church of Rome has provided for this exigency*, by the sacrament of Penance." If their views on this subject, common sense will say, be not Popish, why employ them as a proof of Popery? It is a question for Mr. Boardman to answer. It is certainly not involved in the present undertaking.[1]

---

[1] It is right to say, that Dr. Pusey, with characteristic manliness, assumes the sole responsibility of this whole subject. In his Letter to the Bishop of Oxford, under the head "of sin after Baptism," he says, "the charges on this subject relate simply to myself." The reader will do well, before he enters final judgment against Dr. Pusey, to bear in mind the terms of the xvith article—"*Not every deadly sin*, willingly committed after baptism, is sin against the Holy Ghost, and unpardonable:" and to weigh well those solemn words of the Apostle to the Hebrews—"if we sin wilfully after that we have received the knowledge of the truth, there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins, but a certain fearful looking for of judgment, and fiery indignation, which shall devour the adversaries. He that despised Moses' law died without mercy under two or three witnesses: of how much sorer punishment, suppose ye, shall he be thought worthy, who hath trodden under foot the Son of God, and hath counted the blood of the covenant wherewith he was sanctified an unholy thing, and hath done despite unto the Spirit of grace." And again,—"it is impossible for those who were made partakers of the Holy Ghost, and have tasted the good word of God, and the powers of the world to come, if they shall fall away, to renew them again unto repentance; seeing they crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh, and put him to an open shame." What the meaning of these texts may be, is not to be shown now. They are at least sufficient to induce solemnity of thought and soberness of judgment. The errors of which Dr. Pusey would admonish us, and the wholesome dealing of the Church with sinful man, may be well gathered from the passages which follow.

"This modern system, whose very boast it is to make works of no account; which teaches people, on their death bed, after a life of profligacy and infamy, servants of sin and Satan, destroying, as far as in them lay, the souls of others, to put away all painful remembrance of past sin, and to exult and triumph in having cast away 'their righteousness' (which they had not) 'like filthy

SPECIFICATION VIII. "Another of the worst errors of Popery, which pervades this system, is *the distinction of mortal and venial sin.*"—"God has taught," says Mr. Boardman, "'that the wages of sin is death,'

---

rags,' and to joy as though they had 'fought the good fight,' and been approved soldiers; which would make it, practically easier, and safer almost to be saved without works than with them, speaking often of the danger of relying upon works, and but little of the danger of being lost for want of them; which stifles continually the strong emotions of terror and amazement which GOD has wrought upon the soul, and 'healing slightly the wound' which He has made, makes it often incurable; which makes peace rather than holiness, the end of its ministrations, and by an artificial wrought-up peace, checks the deep and searching agony, whereby GOD, as in a furnace of fire, was purifying the whole man, 'by the Spirit of judgment, and by the Spirit of burning'—this is altogether a spurious system, misapplying the promises of the Gospel, usurping the privileges of Baptism, which it has not to confer, giving peace which it has not to bestow, and going counter to the whole tenor of Scripture 'that every man shall be judged according to his works.'

"Romanism,'as well as Ultra-Protestantism, practically frees a man from his past sins; our Church bids him confess that he is 'tied and bound with the chain' of them, and to pray Him that 'the pitifulness of His great mercy may loose us;' she teaches us, in her daily service, to have our 'sins *ever* before us,' that so GOD may 'hide His face from our sins, and blot out all our iniquities;' she bids us come day by day with 'broken and contrite hearts' which GOD 'will not despise;' to 'rend our hearts' that 'GOD may repent Him of the evil;' to seek of GOD 'correction,' though 'with judgment, not in His anger;' to go daily to our Father, and say unto Him that we are 'no more worthy to be called His sons.' She teaches us daily to confess all the sins of our past life; all our past 'erring and straying,' our *having* 'offended against His holy laws,' *having* 'left undone, what we ought to have done, and done what we ought not to have done;' three times a week she teaches us to pray to be delivered 'from His wrath and from everlasting damnation,' and 'in the day of judgment;' that He would give us 'true repentance, forgive us *all* our sins, negligences, and ignorances.' And in her most solemn service, she would have us approach with 'true penitent hearts;' still gathering before our eyes, all the sins of our past lives, that 'the remembrance of them' being 'grievous unto us, and the burthen of them intolerable,' we may bring them all before Him, pray Him, 'for JESUS CHRIST's sake to forgive us *all* that is past.'

"She guides us from herself, either preaching or blessing, to Him, who is 'the

and that all sin is deadly." (p. 66.) And yet, St. John hath said (1. v. 16.) "If any man see his brother sin a sin which is not unto death, he shall ask, and he shall give him life for them that sin not unto

---

merciful receiver of all true penitent sinners,' and to His untold, unfathomable, mercies in CHRIST JESUS; she would have us continually lean on His mercy, not as confident that our sins were already blotted out, but rather as beholding ourselves 'full of' all the 'sores' which by our past sins, we had inflicted upon our souls, yet trusting that His mercy will yet be greater than our sins, striving to cleanse ourselves, yet awaiting to the end His gracious sentence, whereby He shall say 'I will, be thou clean,' and 'deliver us from the extreme malediction which shall light upon them that shall be set on the left hand, and set us on His right hand, and give us the gracious benediction of His Father, commanding us to take possession of His glorious kingdom.' And so she continues even to the end; she exhorts us *all* twice every day, after her Absolution, to beseech God to 'grant us true repentance'—a truer and deeper repentance than we have; prays for it in the Litany, in connection with our *past* 'sins, negligences, and ignorances;' prays again throughout Lent that (what a modern system looks upon as taking place once only in life) 'God would *create* and make in us *new* and contrite [broken] *hearts;* that we *worthily* lamenting our sins and acknowledging our wretchedness,' &c., and thus, to the verge of the grave, or whenever sickness brings death and judgment in nearer sight, she not only exhorts *all* 'truly to repent,' but prays for them that 'the sense of their weakness may add strength to their faith, and *seriousness* to their repentance.' She would have both deepened in us to our last breath, that we may in penitent trust close our eyes and approach the Judge of all—with the words of that great example of humble repentance and exceeding faith, 'Lord, remember me, when Thou comest into Thy Kingdom.'

"This appears to me then the characteristic difference of the three systems; Romanism as well as Ultra-Protestantism would consult readily for man's feverish anxiety to be altogether at ease; our Church sets him in the way in which GOD's peace may descend upon him, but forestalls not His sentence. She has no second Baptism to give, and so she cannot pronounce him altogether free from his past sins. There are but two periods of *absolute* cleansing, Baptism and the day of Judgment. She therefore teaches him continually to repent, that so his sins *may be* blotted out, though she has no commission to tell him absolutely that they *are;* she repeats to him his LORD's words, 'Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy-laden, and *I* will give you rest,' and so sends him to her LORD that he may 'find rest for his soul,' but does not anticipate His gracious act; she absolves him, 'if he earnestly and heartily de-

death. There is a sin unto death: I do not say that he shall pray for it." "Again," says Mr. Boardman, "the Romanists deny this," (that all sin is deadly) "and so do the Oxfordists. Both teach with the an-

---

sire it,' 'by His authority committed unto' her, and then, (even while holding out her most solemn form of Absolution, as a means of relieving the troubled conscience,) she confesses the incompleteness of her own act, in that she subjoins a prayer for pardon of those sins, from which she had just absolved him; 'O most merciful God, who dost so put away the sins of those who truly repent, that Thou rememberest them no more; open Thine eye of mercy upon this Thy servant, who most earnestly desireth pardon and forgiveness; impute not unto him his former sins.' The very renewal of her Eucharistic absolution 'pardon and deliver you from *all* your sins,' attests that she does not hold them to have been all absolutely remitted; but thus she sets him in a way whereby he may obtain peace; she bids him repent, sorrow, sue for pardon, not forget his repentance, come to Him who can and will give rest, pronounces over him His Absolution, invites him where 'his sinful body may be made clean by His Body, and his soul washed through His most precious Blood,' blesses him with His blessing, 'the peace of God that passeth all understanding,' and so dismisses him, bearing with him, as she hopes, His peace, Who alone is 'the Author of peace,' Whose alone it is to bestow it. And this is altogether in accordance with Scripture, which uniformly speaks of 'peace' as the *direct* gift of God. 'Grace be unto you and peace from God our Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ,' is the standing Apostolic salutation to the Church; and thence is the Church's blessing, 'The peace of God, which passeth all understanding, keep your hearts and minds;' so again 'the Lord of peace give you peace always;' 'My peace I give unto you;' 'the God of hope fill you with all peace and joy in believing;' 'the fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace;' God is the 'God of peace;' our Lord 'is our peace;' nor is peace spoken of any where as coming from any other source but directly from Him.

"The difference then between the views in question is not, as to the hope of pardon to the penitent, not even as to the prospect of peace in this world; but as to what is penitence, and how that peace is to be obtained; whether from man's declarations, or directly from God; whether at first or at last, whenever it pleases God to send it; whether amid forgetfulness of past sin, or while recalling it in bitterness of recollection and praying God for His Son's sake to pardon it; whether amid continued humiliation which saith 'God be merciful to me a sinner,' or amid exultation at being free from self-righteousness. As repentance is God's gift, and God's work in a man's soul, so is there obviously great danger in interfering with it; 'He woundeth' and He must 'heal;' He

cient Pagans, that there are two kinds of sins, mortal and venial." And yet Mr. Boardman's "Confession of Faith" teaches (chap. xxi, § 4.) that "prayer is to be made for things lawful, and for all sorts of men living, or that shall live hereafter; but not for the dead, *nor for those of whom it may be known* [?] *that they have sinned the sin unto death.*" Surely, they must be naughty people, those Presbyterians, to hold, not only with the "Romanists," and "Oxfordists," but even with the "ancient Pagans!" That Dr. Pusey did not think particularly well of Romish views on this and kindred subjects, the following ex-

---

'killeth' and He must 'make alive;' He 'bringeth down to the grave and bringeth up.' They must have had but little acquaintance with wounded consciences, who know not how terribly He does 'chasten man for sin, making his beauty to consume away,' how 'He writeth bitter things against him, and maketh him to possess his former iniquities;' and in this awfulness of His chastisements, which we very often cannot mitigate, though we would, He bids us beware how we interfere with His work in the soul, or apply lenitives, when He is probing the diseased and ulcerous part 'to the very dividing of the soul and body.' These false kindnesses, (which, in one body of Christians, now daily parting more from the Church, are become systematic,)are continually marring the work, which GOD had with a heathful severity begun. The penitent, untimely delivered from his distress, loses the energy of repentance, and the hatred of sin, which GOD was annealing into his soul, and becomes *a commonplace and sickly Christian.* What I would urge then, is to hold out the prospect of peace, but as GOD's gift through the deepening of repentance; not to cut short His work, whether by the sacrament of penance, or inward persuasions, or misapplied promises of the Gospel; but to direct to His mercies in CHRIST; and He, 'who knoweth whereof we are made, and remembereth that we are but dust,' will have pity on them, 'as a father pitieth his own children,'when they have learnt to 'fear Him.' Not peace, but salvation is our end; but peace also He, the GOD of peace, will bestow, as he sees most healthful for them, according to the evenness and consistency of their course; clouding it, if they are amiss or halting; renewing it, when they humble themselves and press onward; and in all cases bestowing upon us more than we deserve for His sake 'Who is our peace.'"—*Letter*, pp. 87, 8; 89, 90, 91; 92–95.

tract will suffice to show. As for the "ancient Pagans," we may as well turn them quite over to Chief Justice Rhadamanthus.

"The Article expressly condemns persons holding two opposite errors, 'those which say they can no more sin as long as they live here,' and 'those who deny the place of forgiveness to such as *truly* repent.' But who '*truly* repent;' what are helps towards *true* repentance; when a man, who has been guilty of 'deadly sin wilfully committed after Baptism,' may be satisfied that he is truly repentant for it; whether and to what degree he should, all his life after, continue his repentance for it; whether he be altogether pardoned, or whether only so long as he continue in a state of penitence; wherein his penitence should consist; whether continued repentance would efface the traces of his sin in himself; whether he might ever in this life look upon himself as restored to the state in which he had been, had he not committed it; whether it affect the degree of his future bliss, or its effects be effaced by his repentance, but their extinction depend upon the continued greatness of his repentance: whether cessation of his active repentance may not bring back degrees of the sin upon him; whether it shall appear again in the day of judgment; these, and the like, are questions upon which the Article does not speak, but upon which a modern popular theology has decided very peremptorily, and will have no interference with its decrees. According to it, the whole office of repentance is to bring men to CHRIST, the terrors of the law are to drive men to dread the punishment due to their sins, to renounce them, to seek for reconciliation through the free mercy of CHRIST; and so far is, of course, true; but when men have thus been brought to 'lay hold of His saving merits,' then, according to them, their sins are done away; they 'are covered;' they can appear no more; 'the handwriting is blotted out;' a man has no more to do with them than to thank CHRIST that he has been delivered from them. This 'apprehension of Christ's merits' is to them instead of Baptism, a full remission of sins, completely effacing them; and so often as any man embraces those merits, so often, according to them, are his sins effaced. To revert to past sin, is to doubt of CHRIST's mercy; to

bear a painful recollection of it, is to be under the bondage of the law; to seek to efface it by repentance, is weakness of faith; to do acts of mercy, or self-denial, or self-abasement, or to fast, with reference to it, is to interfere with the freeness and fulness of the Gospel; to insist upon them, is, to place repentance instead of Christ. This system has but two topics, 'repent, and believe the Gospel;' and so far right; but these two so narrowed, that repentance is to precede faith, faith to supersede repentance. Other offices of repentance, it scarcely entertains in thought, except to denounce or to scoff at.

"It was against this system, my Lord, that I spoke: this abuse of the doctrine of justification by faith is searing men's consciences now, as much as the 'indulgences' of the Romish system did before. It used to be said that 'the Romish was an easy religion to die in;' but even the Romish in its corruptions, scarcely offered terms so easy, at all events made not a boast of the easiness of its terms; if it had but the dregs of the system of the ancient Church, stale and unprofitable as these often were, they had yet something of the strength of the bitterness of the ancient medicine; they, at least, testified to a system, when men made sacrifices for the good of their souls; humbled themselves in dust and ashes; practised self-discipline; 'accused and condemned themselves, that so they might find mercy at their heavenly Father's hand for Christ's sake, and not be accused and condemned in that fearful judgment;' felt 'the remembrance' of their past sins to be 'grievous unto them,' 'the burthen' to be 'intolerable;' 'were grieved and wearied with the burthen of their sins;' 'turned to God in weeping, fasting and praying;' 'bewailed and lamented their sinful life, acknowledged and confessed their offences, and sought to bring forth worthy fruits of penance;' and in cases of notorious sin, were 'put to open penance, and punished in this world that their souls might be saved in the day of the Lord.' The sun of the ancient Church was setting, sadly obscured by the mists and vapours of earth which had gathered round it; yet it did occasionally gleam through on the eye, which watched constantly for it behind those mists; and even to these clouds which half hid it, it imparted oftentimes its own, though a melancholy, lustre. Romanism was, in practice as well as in doctrine, decayed;

yet to those who 'loved the stones and pitied the dust' of the ancient city of God, its very ruins marked the outline, which they might trace out for themselves: treasures were buried there for those who would clear away the heaps, which decay accumulated over them. To the many, her's was a debasing system; yet there might be, and was often, reality in it, to those who would find it.

"The refined distinctions, which she made in carrying out her divisions of mortal and venial sins; her accurate allotment of punishments, (as if she could measure out the degree of guilt contracted by each offence against God;) her inventions of attrition and contrition; the assumption of an absolute power to remit altogether venial, and the eternal consequences of mortal, sins; not to speak now of the sale of indulgences or the commutation of penance for money; these favoured the corruptions of carnal men, stifled the misgivings which might awaken them from their security, lowered the tone and standard, whereat they were to aim, and threw them on the Church, to whom the dispensation of those treasures of mercy were committed, rather than on Him, in whose name she dispensed them. She took upon herself the office of the Judge, anticipated His sentence, and stood in His place."—*Letter*, pp. 82, 7.

In this connexion, Mr. Boardman quotes the Bishop of Exeter's Charge, describing him as their "friend," and "an admirer of the Oxford writings," and all the while rejoicing greatly in the reproofs which he administers. "The Bishop," says Mr. Boardman, after an extract, touching the remission of sin after Baptism, "was not 'as one that beateth the air,' when he penned the latter part of this fine passage." (66.) Well; very probably! The Bishop of Exeter is not often, the Radicals and Romanists both know it well, "as one that beateth the air." But why does Mr. Boardman altogether overlook the Bishop's qualifying words? Why does he leave his readers to suppose that he has nothing to bestow upon the Oxford

writers besides reproof? Why did he not find room for this "fine passage" also?

"There is another subject, on which I would say a few words, because it also has been, and continues to be, the occasion of much excitement and uneasiness to many, who sincerely seek, and would gladly acquiesce in, the Truth, on which ever side it be;—I mean the use of primitive tradition. Some learned and pious ministers of our Church claim for it that it not only was a mode of imparting divine truth, chosen in the Apostolic age by the Holy Spirit, before the Canon of Scripture was formed; but also is still continued to the Church,—and that, as such, it demands the attention and reverence of all Christians.

I will not express an opinion on this matter, because, the Church having delivered no judgment upon it, it would be foreign to my present purpose to give any of my own; my sole object being to caution you against adopting false or exaggerated opinions from others.

I need not tell you that the notion, which I have just stated, has excited the warmest and most clamorous opposition. Those who put it forth are unscrupulously charged with wishing to raise tradition to equal authority with the Scriptures, though they distinctly declare, that they look to it only as 'subsidiary to the Scriptures.'[1] In spite, however, of every such declaration, the notion is assailed with more than ordinary violence,—'Popery,' 'Heresy,' 'The awful Oxford Heresy,' are among the phrases unreservedly applied to it.

Now, do the persons who use this language consider, or understand, what they say? Do they remember, or do they know, that no private man can, without sinful presumption, pronounce any opinion to be heresy, until the Church shall have solemnly declared it such? Do they further remember, or do they need to be informed, that it is not every false opinion in religion which the Church pronounces to be heresy; but only such as is contrary to some article of *the* Faith, or something which by necessary consequence leads to the subversion of some fundamental truth? In the present case, has the Church made any such declaration?—Has it either condemned as

1 "Primitive Tradition recognized by Scripture."—*A Sermon by the Rev. Mr. Keble*, p. 33.

heresy, or in any way condemned the opinion in question? Yes—we shall be told—in its Sixth Article. That Article says, 'Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation: so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an Article of the Faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation.' Do the writers, whose opinion of tradition is so fiercely assailed, contradict this? So far from it, they expressly state, that 'Scripture is the sole and paramount rule of faith,'—that every fundamental point of doctrine is contained in Canonical Scriptures—and that nothing is to be insisted on as an Article of Faith, necessary to salvation, which is not contained therein.

But, while such is their language, while they may truly thus assert, that they are innocent of violating the Sixth Article, can their accusers say the same of themselves? Are they equally free from the offence which they thus unscrupulously charge upon others? Let us see.

By calling the opinion which they oppose, heresy, they affirm, by implication, that it is contrary to an article of the faith; in other words, they say that we are bound to believe as a fundamental article of faith, and therefore of necessity to salvation, that the Holy Spirit did not give tradition as a permanent mode of imparting Divine truth subsidiary to Scripture. But if they affirm this, they are required by the Sixth Article to adduce proof of their assertion from Scripture,—a task which, I am sure, would be most difficult, which I believe is impracticable, and which has not, so far as I know, been seriously attempted by any one worthy of notice. When it shall have been accomplished, we will join in calling on the traditionists to renounce their wicked error, or to submit to be branded as 'heretics.' But, *meanwhile, their accusers should beware how they violate,* not only the Sixth Article of the Church, but also *the Ninth Commandment of God.*"

Will Mr. Boardman tell us who, besides "the air," is beaten in the last sentence? The Bishop of Exeter does certainly dissent from many of the Oxford views. But his language is throughout respectful,

mild and kind. "After all," he says, "let me not be supposed to set myself forward as the advocate of these writers. They need not the aid of such an advocate, and I will not encumber them with it. I am not even their partisan; for I am far from subscribing to all they say, and still farther from always approving the mode in which they say it." This is a manly and a Christian course. The Oxford writers ask, and have a right to ask, no more. "Again," he says, "while I regret the charge of Popery, applied to them, as being as absurd as it is uncharitable; I yet cannot but lament that they sometimes deal with some of the worst corruptions of Rome, in terms not indicating so deep a sense of their pernicious tendency as yet, I doubt not, they feel." These passages are not adduced, as if the point at issue were to be settled by the opinions of any, even of eminent prelates; and there is none more so than he of whom we speak: but, because, if Dr. Philpotts' testimony is good against, it is at least as good in favor of, the accused; because justice is due to him as well as them; and because it is but right to say, that those who catch at a sentence separated from the context, and applaud it, when it suits them, "to the echo," are the same persons who habitually treat the Bishop of Exeter with the rudest disrespect. It is considered but a questionable morality to hold, "All's fair in politics." Who will defend it in a theological discussion?

Specification ix. "Closely allied to the dogma of mortal and venial sins; is that of *Purgatory*."—Doubtless, it is. But, do the Oxford writers teach it?

To say, Yes, "sticks in the throat." To say, No, would be to lose the benefit of a most pregnant prejudice. Hence, such sentences "about it and about it," as the following. "On this subject again the Tractists are reserved and enigmatical. Sometimes they condemn the Romish doctrine stoutly. But this seems to be aimed rather at its details than the principle of it. And the prevailing tone of their observations leaves the impression on the reader's mind, that their antipathy to the doctrine is not so very bitter, but that they might be persuaded out of it." (p. 80.) And again, "This theory lacks but one feature of purgatory, namely, suffering or discipline," (p. 69)—as the old lady's gun wanted nothing, to make it dangerous, but a lock, a stock and a barrel! And again "There seems no good reason why the Oxfordists should not avail themselves of it in *their* purgatory, as well as the Romanists and the Pagans," (poor Pagans, how they haunt him!) "in theirs." And again, "It will be no marvel if some *future* Tract for the Times should tell 'the Anglo Catholic Church,'" &c. &c. But, though, to answer words like these, would be something worse than beating the air; it is well to give some little sample of the Oxford teaching on this subject, for their benefit, who are acquainted with it only through Mr. Boardman.

"Purgatory may be mentioned as another grievous doctrine of Romanism." (It had found a place, the reader will remember, both in the "practical grievances" and in the "irreconcileable differences.") * * * * "I have already stated that Scripture, as interpreted by tradition, does not teach that doctrine." *Tract* No. 71, pp. 12, 13.

"One great unfairness practised by Roman controversialists, has been to adduce, in behalf of their own peculiarities, doctrines or

customs of the Primitive Church, which resembling them in appearance, are really of a different character." * * * * * *

"But in no instance is this fallacious procedure more strikingly seen than as regards their doctrine of *Purgatory*, which they defend by notions and usages in the early Church, quite foreign to the distressing tenet which we challenge them to prove." No. 52, p. 1.

"As regards the doctrine of Purgatorial suffering, there have been for many ages in the Roman Church gross corruptions of its own doctrine, untenable as that doctrine is even by itself. The decree of the Council of Trent, which will presently be introduced, acknowledges the fact. Now we believe that those corruptions still continue; that Rome has never really set herself in earnest to eradicate them. The pictures of Purgatory so commonly seen in countries in communion with Rome, the existence of Purgatorian societies, the means of subsistence accruing to the clergy from the belief in it, afford a strange contrast to the simple wording and apparent innocence of the decree by which it is made an article of faith. It is the contrast between poison in its lifeless seed, and the same developed, thriving and rankly luxuriant, in the actual plant.

"And lastly, since we are in no danger of becoming Romanists, and may bear to be dispassionate, and (I may say) philosophical, in our treatment of their errors, some passages in the following account of Purgatory are more calmly written than would satisfy those who were engaged with a victorious enemy at their doors. Yet, whoever be our opponent, Papist or Latitudinarian, it does not seem to be wrong to be as candid and conceding as justice and charity allow us. Nor is it unprofitable to weigh accurately how much the Romanists have committed themselves in their formal determinations of doctrines, and how far by God's merciful providence they have been restrained and overruled; and again how far they must retract, in order to make amends to Catholic truth and unity." Tract 79, p. 3.

Calm words are these, and Christian-like; and make us think of that beautiful text of Isaiah, which Keble takes as the motto for his "Christian Year"—"In quietness and in confidence shall be your strength." "There are many men," says a late writer, "who

are content to allege with a noisy and eternal iteration, that the Pope is Antichrist, and that the Roman Church is the harlot of Babylon. Mr. Newman stands at the Antipodes from these declaimers, and treats the system of Popery in another way. In declaring against the corruptions of Romanism, he is as staunch a Protestant as themselves; but the difference is, that he does more than protest: he searches and discriminates, he argues and demonstrates, while they can only cry, *Wolf!*" This is not quoted, as knowing, or even conjecturing that Mr. Newman is the author of the Tract just cited. Those who would know his views upon this subject, will find them in his "Lectures on the Prophetical office of the Church, viewed relatively to Romanism and popular Protestantism;" Lecture iii. "*Doctrine of Infallibility morally considered.*"

Specification x. "If the Oxford writers are shy of confessing a purgatory, no such difference can be imputed to them in reference to the practice of *offering prayers for the dead.*"—And the proof of this is just one page—a mutilated quotation from a Tract, and a mutilated quotation from the Bishop of Exeter's Charge; carefully inserting all his words of disagreement, (for it amounts to nothing more,) and as carefully omitting what he says, in this connection, and takes delight in saying again and again, of his "unfeigned respect for the integrity and simplicity of these writers, as well as for their eminent learning and ability." The history of their connection with the subject will be interesting; and illustrate, at the same time, the sort of dealing to which their oppo-

nents have thought it lawful, not to say, have been compelled, to have recourse. Tract No. 63, entitled, "The Antiquity of the existing Liturgies," contained a statement, from Mr. Palmer's "Origines Liturgicæ," of the particulars in which all ancient Liturgies agree. All, for instance, contain, in the Communion service, the Hymn, "Therefore with Angels and Archangels," &c.; all contain a prayer answering in substance to that "for the whole state of Christ's Church;" all contain "another prayer (which has been excluded from the English Ritual) "for the rest and peace of all those who have departed this life in God's faith and fear," concluding with a prayer for communion with them. To this mere statement of a historical fact nothing was added, nor any more importance given to it than to any other that was named. It was barely mentioned, and from the nature of the case could not have been omitted. When, some time after, it was drawn into notice by an opponent, with a view to involve the Tracts in the suspicion of a Popish tendency, Dr. Pusey replied to the writer, in what is now Tract No. 77, in a way which he will never be able to forget: showing that the usage alluded to was not connected with the doctrine of Purgatory; that it had been justified by such divines as Archbishops Wake[1]

[1] It appears that *all the ancient Liturgies agree* in containing the commemoration of *the faithful dead*. The value of this circumstance is thus presented by Archbishop Wake, *Dissertation on the Apostolical Fathers*, (chap. ix. § 20) "Since it can hardly be doubted but that those holy Apostles and Evangelists, did give some direction for the administration of the blessed Eucharist in those Churches; it may reasonably be presumed that some of those orders are still remaining in those Liturgies which have been brought down to us under their

and Usher,[1] and Bishops Taylor,[2] Bull,[3] and An-

---

names; and that *those prayers wherein they all agree, (in sense, at least, if not in words) were first prescribed in the same, or like terms, by those Apostles and Evangelists.*"

[1] Archbishop Usher, in his "Answer to a Jesuit's challenge," treats the subject fully. Two sentences will here suffice. (chap. vii.) "Our Romanists indeed do commonly take it for granted, that 'purgatory and prayer for the dead be so closely linked together, that the one doth necessarily follow the other;' but in so doing they reckon without their host, and greatly mistake the matter. For however they may deal with their own devices as they please, and link their prayers with their purgatory as closely as they list; *yet shall they never be able to show, that the commemoration and prayers for the dead, used by the ancient Church, had any relation unto their purgatory;* and therefore, whatever they were, *Popish prayers, we are sure, they were not.*"

[2] Just as clear and confident is Bishop Taylor, *Dissuasive from Popery*, (chap. i. § iv.) "The ancient Churches, in their offices, and the fathers, in their writings, did teach, and practice respectively, prayer for the dead. Now because the Church of Rome does so too, and *more than so*, relates her prayers to the doctrine of purgatory, and for the souls there detained; *her doctors vainly suppose, that whenever the holy fathers speak of prayers for the dead, that they conclude for purgatory; which vain conjecture is as false as it is unreasonable.*"

[3] "Prayers for the dead," says Bishop Bull (*Corruptions of the Church of Rome*, vol. ii. p. 261, Burton's edition) "as founded on the hypothesis of Purgatory, (and we no otherwise reject them,) fall together with it. The prayers for the dead used in the ancient Church were of two sorts; either the common and general commemoration of all the faithful at the oblation of the holy Eucharist, or the particular prayers used at the funerals of any of the faithful lately deceased. The former respected their final absolution, and the consummation of their bliss at the resurrection; like as that our Church useth, both in the office for the Communion, and in that for the Burial of the Dead:" (see the extract from Dr. Pusey's Letter) "which, indeed, seems to be no more than we daily pray for in that petition of the Lord's Prayer, (if we rightly understand it,) 'Thy kingdom come!' The latter were also charitable omens and good wishes of the faithful living, as it were accompanying the soul of the deceased to the joys of paradise, of which they believed it already possessed. * * * * In a word, let any understanding and unprejudiced person attentively observe the prayers for the dead in the most undoubtedly ancient Liturgies, * * * and he will be so far from believing the Roman purgatory upon the account of those prayers, that he must needs see they make directly against it. For they all run (as even that prayer for the dead which is unadvisedly

drews,[1] to mention no more names; and that even Bucer and Calvin, though they objected to it in the former Liturgy,[2] from which it was withdrawn, clearly denied

---

left by the Romanists, in their own Canon of the Mass, as a testimony against themselves) in this form—'for all that are in peace or at rest in the Lord.' Now how can they be said to be 'in peace or at rest in the Lord,' who are supposed to be in a state of misery and torment?"

[1] The following, which was incorporated by Bishop Andrews, in his Private Devotions, will afford, what the reader will desire to see, a specimen of the prayers under consideration. It is from the ancient Liturgy of the Church of Jerusalem. "Grant that we may all find mercy and favour, with all thy saints, who, from the beginning of this world, have pleased Thee, in their several generations, Patriarchs, Prophets, Apostles, Martyrs, and every just spirit made perfect in the faith of Thy Christ, from righteous Abel even unto this day; do thou give them and us rest in the region of the living, in the bosom of our holy Fathers, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, whence sorrow, grief and lamentation are banished away, where the light of Thy countenance shines continually; and vouchsafe to bring them, and us, to the full enjoyment of Thy heavenly kingdom."

[2] The part of this Prayer omitted in the revision of the Liturgy, was as follows—"We commend unto Thy mercy, O Lord, all other Thy servants, which are departed hence from us with the sign of faith, and do now rest in the sleep of peace: grant unto them, we beseech Thee, Thy mercy and contenting peace; and that at the day of the general resurrection, we, and all they which be of the mystical body of thy Son, may altogether be set at His right hand, and hear that His most joyful voice, 'Come unto me, O ye that be blessed of my Father, and possess the kingdom which is prepared for you from the beginning of the world.' Grant this, O Father, for Jesus Christ's sake, our only Mediator and Advocate." Neither Calvin nor Bucer, as indeed they could not—they were too well versed in ancient learning—objected to this prayer as Papistical. Bucer says (*Works*, p. 467) "I know that this custom of praying for departed saints is very old, although there is no mention of it in the description of the Lord's Supper by Justin Martyr;" and rejects it as not in Scripture. Calvin (*Letter to the Protector*) says, "I hear that in the celebration of the Supper there is repeated a prayer for the departed, and *I well know that this cannot be construed into an approbation of the Papistical Purgatory*. Nor am I ignorant that there can be brought forward an ancient rite of making mention of the departed, that so the communion of all the faithful, being united into one body, might be set forth." He rejects it, as a human addition to a thing so holy as the Supper of the Lord. Would that Calvinists were more like Calvin!

that it connected itself at all with Purgatory. "Since that time," says Dr. Pusey, in his Letter, "neither in Tracts nor Sermons, orally or in writing, have we any way inculcated it; and the late publicity, which the topic has acquired, has been independent of us."

"Here also, my Lord," he writes to his Diocesan, "we would contend that our Church keeps her 'via media;' both Romanist and Ultra-Protestant dogmatize about the state of departed souls; the Romanist, following a natural instinct of human nature, decides that almost all souls, undergo a painful purification after death, by which 'Infectum eluitur scelus, aut exuritur igni.' The Ultra-Protestant, supposing all sins to be absolutely hidden and covered by the imputation of CHRIST's righteousness, decides as peremptorily that the departed saints are already in *full* possession of the joys of heaven; he conceives of them as already 'like the angels of God in heaven;' he speaks of the 'joys of Heaven' as already bestowed upon them: consistently with his theory, he leaves out of sight, 'judgment to come' as well as the 'resurrection of the body.' The world, now as in Homer's time, thinks of them as ἀμενηνὰ κάρηνα, compassionates them as inactive, and withdrawn from *their* world, despises or forgets them. Our Church, in contrast to all these, cherishes their memory; blesses GOD for them; thinks of them as 'resting in Christ,' and of their 'spirits' as 'living with God in joy and felicity,' yet desires 'their and our perfect consummation and bliss, both in body and soul, in His eternal and everlasting glory.' She holds 'all who depart hence in the Lord,' to be 'in peace and at rest,' and this was held by the Ancient Church also, and, as being inconsistent with Purgatory, is the very point of divergence from Rome, she regards them as in a state of, as yet, imperfect happiness, and so differs from the Ultra-Protestant; and in both, her view coincides with the prayers of the Ancient Church, which speak of those departed as at rest, yet prays 'that God would show them mercy, and hasten the resurrection, and give a 'blessed sentence in the great day.' So that although, for the safety of her children, she relinquished the practice, her doctrine is in accordance with it.

"Why narrow thus what our Church has left undefined? Why,

if, when our Church prays that God would 'give us grace to follow their good examples, that *with them*, we may be partakers of His heavenly kingdom,' any think that she longs for *their* 'final consummation in bliss,' also, should any one seek to hinder it? Or, if any, understanding in a primitive sense a primitive prayer, 'most humbly beseeching Thee to grant that by the merits and Passion of Thy Son Jesus Christ, and through faith in His Blood, we and *all Thy whole Church* may obtain remission of our sins, and *all other benefits of His Passion*,' should think that those emphatic words, '*all Thy whole Church*,' were not to be restrained to the Church militant, but included that portion of the Church also, which is at rest, and prayed that they also might enjoy such 'benefits of His Passion,' as belonged to their state of rest, why should he be hindered?"—pp. 188, 9.

Such is the case, and such the course adopted by the Oxford writers. Many will agree, no doubt, with learned Mr. Palmer, in his judgment, as to the omission made at the revision of the Liturgy; "The satisfactory and sufficient reason for the omission of such prayers in the English Liturgy is that they were *inexpedient*. Considering the circumstances of the times, more evil than good would have been the result of the continuance of this practice." *Origines Liturgicæ*, ii. p.96. But none who understand the subject, can well presume to say, what Calvin so expressly disavowed, that the commemoration of the faithful, practised, of old, and favoured by Dr. Pusey, was a Popish error. None, who respect themselves, will charge upon the Oxford writers the desire to force it upon others, or even to bring it into public notice. So far from wishing that the prayers in question should be re-inserted, they say emphatically, (No. 77, p. 28.)—"We never have, nor do we wish for any alteration in the Liturgy of our Church. We

bless God that our lot has fallen in her bosom; that he has preserved in her the essentials of primitive doctrines, and a Liturgy so holy; and although I cannot but think its first form preferable, alteration is out of the question: THERE CANNOT BE REAL ALTERATION WITHOUT A SCHISM." These capitals are theirs, and the more forcible, as they seldom use them.

SPECIFICATION XI. "Another indication of the Popish tendency of this system, is to be seen in the experiment, its authors are trying, of *instituting new Saints' days*. My Right Rev. correspondent [?] does not require to be informed that they have (in imitation of the Papists) set apart a day for the religious commemoration of Bishop Ken, and even constructed and published a Matin Service for Bishop Ken's day."—One scarcely knows by what name such a statement should be called. The impression it must leave upon the minds of those who know no more than is here said, will certainly be false. There is no evidence at all, that the authors of "this system" are "trying" the experiment of "instituting new Saints' days;" neither have they set apart a day to the religious commemoration of Bishop Ken. What they have done, is best stated in their own words. The 75th number of the Tracts for the Times is entitled, "On the Roman Breviary, as embodying the substance of the devotional services of the Church Catholic." It opens thus.

"There is so much of excellence and beauty in the services of the Breviary, that were it skilfully set before the Protestant by Roman controversialists, as her book of devotions received in their communion, it would undoubtedly raise a prejudice in their favour, if he were

even ignorant of the circumstances of the case, and but ordinarily candid and unprejudiced. To meet this danger, is one principal object of the following pages; in which what is good and true in those Devotions will be claimed, and on reasonable grounds, for the Church Catholic, in opposition to the Roman Church; whose only real claim above other Churches is that of having, on the one hand, preserved the service with less of mutilation and abridgment, and on the other, having adopted into it certain additions and novelties, ascertainable to be such in history, as well as being corruptions doctrinally. In a word, it will be attempted to wrest a weapon out of our adversaries' hands; who have in this, as in many other instances, appropriated to themselves a treasure which was ours as much as theirs; and then, on our attempting to recover it, accuse us of borrowing what we have but lost through inadvertence. The publication, then, of the selections, which it is proposed presently to give from their services, is, as it were, an act of re-appropriation."

Among the uses of the undertaking are mentioned—to illustrate our own Prayer Book, as being taken from it; to suggest matter for our private devotions; to impress a truer sense of the excellence and profitableness of the Psalms than it is the fashion of this age to entertain; and, by showing the corruptions to be of late date, to add one more fact, discriminating the Roman from the Primitive Church. With these views, there is, first, the history of the Breviary, and, then, selections from it. After the selections, the author gives, by way of illustrating the mode of its compilation, two *sketches of services, after the manner of the Breviary;* remarking, "these have been added, to suggest to individual Christians a means of *carrying out, in private,* the principle and spirit of those inestimable forms of devotion, which are contained in our authorised Prayer Book." One of them, expressly entitled, "for social or private devotion," is

a design for a service for March 21st, "the day on which Bishop Ken was taken from the Church below;" the other, "a service of thanksgiving and commemoration for the anniversaries of the days of death of friends or relations." They are nothing more than *exercises in liturgical composition.* They propose neither new saints, nor new saints' days. They are not in imitation of the Papists; since the models on which they are formed are older far than the corruptions of the Church of Rome. They aim not at canonizing Bishop Ken, or in any other way intruding on the Calendar. They are but hints for their devotions, after primitive models, which private Christians may adopt and vary, at their pleasure. And, instead of meditating any innovation on the Prayer Book, as the Bishop of Exeter seems to have misunderstood them; when the author speaks of "carrying out and completing" what the Reformers have begun, he merely means, by taking, for private use, such of the Catholic portions of the Breviary as they have not adopted for our public services.

Specification xii. "For instance, *the invocation of Saints and the worship of Images.*"—These ominous words, displayed on Mr. Boardman's page in double capitals, seem "confirmation strong" that the writers of whom he speaks, must be far gone in Popery. But it is not half so bad as it appears. "*I do not charge them,*" he says, in the very next sentence, "*with advocating these practices,* but"—but what?—"they are far from dealing with them in the ordinary style of Protestants." Very true, no doubt: and perhaps not the worse for that. What

Mr. Boardman alludes to, as "the ordinary style of Protestants," is *very ordinary*. Mr. Boardman occupies but half a dozen lines with this head; and them with an extract, which amounts to nothing, from Mr. Froude's Remains. A great improvement, this, within a year or two: since there were persons, professing and calling themselves Christians, who deliberately made the Tract on the Breviary, just spoken of, the ground of charging on the Oxford writers, that they recommend the invocation both of Saints and Angels; and this notwithstanding sentences like these —"these portions of the Breviary (the invocation of the Virgin, and other Saints,) carry with them their own plain condemnation, in the judgment of an English Christian;" and the least objectionable of the corrupt additions "do but sanction and encourage that direct worship of the Blessed Virgin, and the Saints, which is the great practical offence of the Latin Church, and so are a serious evil."

Specification xiii. "This brings me to the doctrine *of the Real Presence*."—"The Tractists," Mr. Boardman adds, "deny Transubstantiation." One would suppose that this should end the matter. But, no! "They hold that the real body and blood of Christ are present in the Eucharist;" and then, after a few quotations from a tract by Bishop Cosin—"nothing certainly could be more at variance with the language of your 28th Article, which says, 'The body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the supper *only* after an heavenly and spiritual manner'"—as if "heavenly" and "spiritual" were the antithesis of "real." Much more sensibly does Dr. Pusey

write, "the *more* real *because* spiritual." But we must proceed, on this important point, in order, and with the adduction of authorities—the more, as the reverential suggestion of a writer in the Tracts, that "the unnecessary discussion of the Holy Eucharist should be avoided, as almost certain to lead to profane and rationalistic thoughts," has seemed to Mr. Boardman to authorize a most unworthy and unwarrantable suspicion.[1] The two points are, that in the

---

[1] Referring to this recommendation, he remarks: "One is ready to *suspect* that there must be some other motive than the one assigned, for wishing to arrest the controversy about transubstantiation. I offer no conjecture as to what it is; but there is a sentence or two in Knox and Jebb's correspondence, (a work which contains not merely the 'germs' of this system, but in some particulars, a fuller development of it than we have *yet* been favoured with in the Tracts,) which I beg leave to quote on this point: 'Deep measures (says Mr. Knox) have been taken for making our *re-union* (the Church of England and the Roman Catholic Church) practicable in the fulness of time; but little less deep measures have also been taken for keeping it off until that time should be fully come. Such a measure I take to be the decree of the Council of Lateran in the year (I think) 1215, under Innocent III. Until then, the actual tenet of transubstantiation had not been enjoined, and the believer in the real presence was equally catholic, whether he did, or did not, suppose a change in the substance of the elements. * * * * * *I am ready to think this will prove our last remaining barrier to coalescence.*'"

It were well if he had *begged leave* to quote correctly. The real sense of Mr. Knox, is had, by adding what follows, to the words "substance of the elements." "Accordingly, our Church is undeniably catholic, according to the catholicity which preceded that period; but what was then, for the first time, pronounced, we resist, and must resist. I am ready to think this will prove our last remaining barrier to coalescence. Had Archbishop Wake known as much as I happen by this time to know, of the differences between us and the Church of Rome, he would not have written a second letter on the subject. He would have seen, at once, that the project was as unfeasible, rebus sic stantibus, as a camel going through the eye a needle." And, in the Wilberforce Correspondence, Mr. Knox concurs in the opinion, "that of all possible projects which could be devised by the wayward will of man, that of such a re-union is the wildest and most pernicious."—So much for being "ready to suspect!"

Tracts, Transubstantiation is not taught; and that the doctrine of the Real Presence, which is taught, is not Popery.

For the first, there needs no proof, so far as Mr. Boardman is concerned; since he expressly says, "The Tractists deny transubstantiation." But, to make "assurance doubly sure"—reminding the reader of the expression of the "irreconcilable differences," "the doctrine of transubstantiation" "is profane and impious"—some half dozen passages are taken, as at random, from their writings.

"As to the *manner* of the presence of the body and blood of our LORD in the Blessed Sacrament, we that are Protestant and Reformed, according to the ancient Catholic Church, do not search into the manner of it with perplexing inquiries. . . . Had the Romish maintainers of Transubstantiation done the same, they would not have determined and decreed, and then imposed as an article of faith absolutely necessary to salvation, a manner of presence, newly by them invented, under pain of the most direful curse; and there would have been in the Church less wrangling, and more peace and unity than now is."—No. 27, p. 2.—*Bishop Cosin on Transubstantiation.*

"It is in vain that they bring Scripture to defend this their stupendous doctrine [transubstantiation]; and it is not true, what they so often and so confidently affirm, that the Universal Church hath always constantly owned it, being it was not so much as heard of in the Church for many ages, and hath been but lately approved by the Pope's authority in the Councils of Lateran and Trent."—*Ibid.* p. 16

"The Romish Church corrupted and marred the Apostolic doctrine in two ways—first, by the error of Transubstantiation, secondly, by that of Purgatory; and in both there occurs that peculiar corruption of the administrators of the Romish Church, that they countenance so much more of profitable error than in their abstract system they acknowledge."—*No.* 81. *On the Eucharistic Sacrifice*, p. 7.

"We can see how a person's whole views of sanctification by

the Holy Ghost will be affected by Hoadly's low notions of the Lord's Supper; or how the error of Transubstantiation has modified other true doctrine, so as to cast into the shade the one oblation once offered upon the Cross; or how the addition of the single practice of 'soliciting the saints to pray for men,' has in the Romish Church obscured the primary articles of Justification and of the Intercession of our Blessed Lord."—*Ibid.* 2nd Ed. p. 6.

"It is 'Jesus Christ, before our eyes evidently set forth, crucified among us.' Not before our bodily eyes; so far, every thing remains to the end of that heavenly communion, as it did at the beginning. What was bread remains bread, and what was wine remains wine. We need no carnal, earthly, visible miracle, to convince us of the presence of the Lord incarnate."—*Ibid.* vol. iv. p. 167.

The more important point, then, is to show, secondly, that the doctrine of the Real Presence, which they do teach, is not Popish. Their teaching may be stated thus.

"We believe the doctrine of our Church to be, that in the Communion, there is a true, real, actual, though Spiritual, *(or rather the more real, because spiritual)* communication of the Body and Blood of Christ to the believer through the Holy Elements; that there is a true, real, spiritual, Presence of Christ at the Holy Supper; more real than if we could, with Thomas, feel him with our hands, or thrust our hands into His side; that this is bestowed upon faith and received by faith, as is every other Spiritual gift, but that our faith is but a receiver of God's real, mysterious, precious, gift; that faith opens our eyes to see what is really there, and our hearts to receive it; but that it is there independently of our faith. And this real, Spiritual Presence it is, which makes it so awful a thing to approach unworthily."—*Pusey's Letter*, pp. 128, 129.

That this is no Popish teaching, our Lord Jesus Christ himself is witness;

"And as they were eating, Jesus took bread, and blessed it, and brake it, and gave it to the disciples, and said, Take, eat; this is

MY BODY. And he TOOK THE CUP, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, SAYING, Drink ye all of it: for THIS IS MY BLOOD of the New Testament, WHICH IS SHED for many FOR THE REMISSION OF SINS." —*St. Matthew*, XXVI. 26, 27.

The Apostle Paul is witness;

"*The cup* of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of *the blood of Christ? The bread* which we break, is it not the communion of *the body of Christ?*"—1 *Corinthians*, X, 16.

The Liturgy is witness;

"Wherefore it is our duty to render most humble and hearty thanks to Almighty God, our heavenly Father, for that *he hath given his Son* our Saviour Jesus Christ, not only to die for us, but also *to be our spiritual food and sustenance in that holy Sacrament.*"

"Grant us therefore, gracious Lord, *so to eat the flesh of thy dear Son Jesus Christ, and to drink his blood*, that our sinful bodies may be made clean by his body, and our souls washed through his most precious blood, and that we may evermore *dwell in him and he in us.*"

"Humbly beseeching thee, that we, and all others who shall be partakers of this Holy Communion, *may worthily receive the most precious Body and Blood of thy Son Jesus Christ*, be filled with thy grace and heavenly benediction, and made one body with him, *that he may dwell in them, and they in him.*"

"We most heartily thank thee, for that thou dost vouchsafe to feed us who have duly received these holy mysteries, with *the spiritual food of the most precious Body and Blood of thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ.*"

The Catechism is witness;

Q. "What is the inward part or thing signified?

A. *The Body and Blood of Christ*, which are spiritually taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper.

Q. What are the benefits whereof we are partakers thereby?

A. The strengthening and refreshing of our souls *by the Body and Blood of Christ*, as our bodies are by the bread and wine."

The Article is witness;

"The Supper of the Lord is not only a sign of the love that Christians ought to have among themselves one to another; but rather it is a Sacrament of our redemption by Christ's death: insomuch that to such as rightly, worthily, and with faith receive the same, *the bread* which we break, *is a partaking of the body of Christ;* and likewise *the cup* of blessing *is a partaking of the blood of Christ.*"

"The body of Christ is *given*,[1] taken, and eaten in the Supper, only after a heavenly and spiritual manner."

The Homily is witness;

"But thus much we must be sure to hold, that in the Supper of the Lord there is no vain ceremony, no bare sign, no untrue figure of a thing absent: but, as the Scripture saith, the table of the Lord, the bread and cup of the Lord, the memory of Christ, the annunciation of his death, yea, *the communion of the body and blood of the Lord, is a marvellous incorporation*, which, by the operation of the Holy Ghost (the very bond of our connection with Christ) is, *through faith, wrought in the souls of the faithful*, whereby not only their souls live to eternal life, but they surely trust to win to their bodies a resurrection to immortality.—*Concerning the Sacrament*, Oxford, p. 406.

The martyr Cranmer is a witness;

"Christ saith of the bread, 'This is my body;' and of the cup he saith, 'This is my blood.' Wherefore we ought to believe that *in the sacrament we receive truly the body and blood of Christ.* For God is almighty (as ye heard in the creed.) He is able, therefore, to do all things, what he will. And as Saint Paul writeth, he called those things which be not as if they were. Wherefore, when Christ taketh bread and saith, 'Take, eat, this is my body,' we ought not to doubt but *we eat his very body.* And when he taketh the cup and saith, 'Take, drink, this is my blood,' we ought to think assuredly that *we drink his very blood.* And this we must believe, if we will be counted Christian men.

"And whereas in this perilous time certain deceitful persons be

---

[1] Not merely *received.*

found in many places, who of very frowardness will not grant that there is the body and blood of Christ, but deny the same, for none other cause but that they cannot compass, by man's blind reason, how this thing should be brought to pass; ye, good children, shall with all diligence beware of such persons, that ye suffer not yourselves to be deceived by them. For such men surely are not true Christians, neither as yet have they learned the first article of the creed, which teacheth that God is almighty, which ye, good children, have already perfectly learned. Wherefore, eschew such erroneous opinions, and believe the words of our Lord Jesus, that *you eat and drink his very body and blood*, although man's reason cannot comprehend *how and after what manner* the same is there present. For the wisdom of reason must be subdued to the obedience of Christ, as the Apostle Paul teacheth."—*Tracts of Anglican Fathers*, p. 38.

The martyr Ridley is a witness;

"For both you and I agree herein, that *in the Sacrament is the very true and naturall bodie and bloud of Christ*, even that which was borne of the Virgine Mary, which ascended into heaven, which sitteth on the right hand of God the Father, which shall come from thence to judge the quicke and the deade, only we differ *in modo* in the way and manner of being; we confess all one thing to be in the Sacrament, and dissent in the manner of being there: I, being fully by God's word thereto perswaded, confess Christ's naturall bodie to be in the Sacrament indeede by spirit and grace, because that *whosoever reeeiveth worthilie that bread and wine, receiveth effectuously Christ's bodie and drinketh his bloud*, that is, he is made effectually partaker of his passion; and you make a grosser kinde of being, enclosing a naturall, a lively, and a mooving bodie under the shape or forme of bread and wine.

"Now this difference considered, to the question thus I answere; that in the Sacrament of the Altar is the naturall bodie and bloud of Christ *veré et realiter*, indeed and really, if you take these tearmes in deede and really for spiritually by grace and efficacie; for so every worthie receiver receiveth the verie true bodie of Christ; but if you meane really and indeed, so that thereby you would include a lively and a moveable bodie under the formes of bread and wine,

then in that sense is not Christ's body in the Sacrament really and indeed."—*Wordsworth's Biography*, iii. 237.

"Judicious Hooker" is a witness;

"The Eucharist is not a bare sign or figure only. *These holy mysteries*, received in due manner, do instrumentally both *make us partakers of that Body and Blood which were given for the life of the world;* and besides, also impart unto us, even in *true and real*, though mystical, manner, the very Person of our Lord himself, whole, perfect and entire."—*Ecclesiastical Polity*, V. lxvii. 8.

And again;

"Let it be sufficient for me presenting myself at the Lord's Table to know what there I receive from Him, without searching or inquiring of the manner how Christ performeth His promise; let disputes and questions, enemies to piety, abatements of true devotion, and hitherto in this cause but over patiently heard, let them take their rest; let curious and sharp-witted men beat their heads about what questions themselves will, the very letter of the word of Christ giveth plain security that *these Mysteries do as nails fasten us to His very Cross, that by them we draw out, as touching efficacy, force and virtue, even the blood of his gored side: in the wounds of our* REDEEMER *we there dip our tongues, we are dyed red both within and without*, our hunger is satisfied, and our thirst for ever quenched; they are things wonderful which he feeleth, great which he seeth, and unheard-of which he uttereth, whose soul is possessed of this Paschal Lamb, and made joyful in the strength of this new wine, this Bread hath in it more than the substance which our eyes behold, this cup hallowed with solemn benedictions availeth to the endless life and welfare of the soul and body, in that it serveth as well for a medicine to heal our infirmities and purge our sins, as for a sacrifice of thanksgiving; with touching it sanctifieth, it enlighteneth with belief, it truly conformeth us unto the image of Jesus Christ; what these elements are in themselves it skilleth not, it is enough that *to me which take them, they are the Body and Blood of Christ*, His promise in witness hereof sufficeth, His word He knoweth which way to accomplish; why should any cogitation possess the mind of

a faithful communicant but this, O my God, Thou art true, O my soul, thou art happy!"—*Ecclesiastical Polity*, V. lxvii. 12.

"The Reformed Dutch Church" is a witness;

"We err not when we say, that *what is eaten and drunk by us is the proper and natural body, and the proper blood of Christ.* But the manner of our partaking of the same is not by the mouth, but by the Spirit, through faith. * * * * * * This feast is a spiritual table, at which Christ communicates himself, with all his benefits, to us, and gives us there to enjoy both himself, and the merits of his sufferings and death, nourishing, strengthening and comforting our poor comfortless souls, by *the eating of his flesh*, quickening and refreshing them by *the drinking of his blood.*"—*Confession of Faith*, Article xxxv.

Nay, "the Presbyterian Church" is a clear witness;

"Worthy receivers, outwardly partaking of the visible elements in this Sacrament, do then also inwardly by faith, *really and indeed*, yet not carnally and corporally, but spiritually, receive and feed upon Christ crucified, and all benefits of his death: *the body and blood of Christ* being then, not corporally or carnally in, with or under the bread and wine; yet AS REALLY, but spiritually PRESENT to the faith of believers in that ordinance, as the elements themselves are, to their outward senses."—*Confession of Faith*, xxix, 7.

Perhaps, by this time, Mr. Boardman may think, enough said! How can we better close the subject than in Dr. Pusey's words—enclosing, as they do, those beautiful sayings of the Fathers, from the first part of the Homily, of the worthy receiving of the Sacrament.

"We do not then yield to the Romanists, as to the greatness of our privileges; we do not think that our LORD is less really and spiritually present than they; that He communicates Himself less by His Sacraments than they; that we less receive His Body and Blood, that our sinful bodies are less cleansed by His glorious Body:

that it is less 'the salve of immortality and sovereign preservative against death; a deifical communion; the sweet dainties of our Saviour; the pledge of eternal health; the defence of faith; the hope of the Resurrection; the food of immortality; the healthful grace; the conservatory to everlasting life;' we do not believe 'This is My Body' less than they; we blame them, not as exceeding as to the greatness of the spiritual gift contained in that Sacrament (all human language and thoughts must fall short), but for their carnal conceptions of it; for attempting to explain to man's senses the *mode* of his SAVIOUR's Presence; for trying to solve the apparent contradiction that the elements are still what they were, but are, over and above, *to us* the Body and Blood of our LORD; for longing, with the weak faith of Nicodemus, to know the *how* of things Divine and Spiritual, and so for debasing them, and by their explanations leading, at least their Priesthood, to pride, and then to unbelief."—*Letter*, pp. 129, 130.

SPECIFICATION XIV. "The only remaining feature of these Tracts, I propose to notice, is their doctrine concerning *the Rule of Faith.*"—"On this fundamental question," says Mr. Boardman, "they side with the Church of Rome, in maintaining the insufficiency of the Bible as a rule of faith, and the binding obligation of 'Catholic traditions.'" And, in the next sentence, strangely observes—"that they differ from Rome as to what these traditions are, is *a matter of subordinate moment!*" The very point in question, we assert, and mean to show. Does Mr. Boardman in his zeal against the very name "tradition," forget that Paul speaks of them? As, to the Corinthians (1, xi, 2.) "Now I praise you brethren, that ye remember me in all things, and keep the ordinances (the marginal reading is, *traditions*) as I delivered them unto you." And, to the Thessalonians (2, ii, 15.) "Therefore brethren, stand fast, and hold the *tradi-*

tions which ye have been taught, whether *by word* or our epistle;" and again (2. iii, 6.) "Now we command you, brethren, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye withdraw yourselves from every brother that walketh disorderly, and not after the *tradition* which he received from us." Would it be "a matter of subordinate moment," if the "Catholic traditions," of which the Oxford writers speak, were shown to be of the same nature as St. Paul's traditions? But, "the Bible is, in the judgment of these writers, a very obscure book." (p. 76.) Well; did not St. Peter entertain very much the same judgment, not only of St. Paul's writings, but of "the other Scriptures?"—"Even as our beloved brother Paul also, *according to the wisdom given unto him*, hath written unto you; as also in all his epistles, speaking in them of these things; *in which are some things hard to be understood*, which they that are unlearned and unstable wrest, as they do also *the other scriptures*, unto their own destruction." (2. iii, 15, 16.) —"With her, (Rome) they hold that the Bible cannot be understood without the aid of the Church." (76.) Was it Romish in the Ethiopian Eunuch to answer, and in St. Luke to record his answer, to the Deacon Philip—"Understandest thou what thou readest?" "How can I, except some man should guide me?" (Acts viii, 30.) Could it have been with Romish views that Dr. Miller, in his Lecture, wrote, "we may infer from what has been said, the duty and importance of all the members, and especially the ministers of the Presbyterian Church, exerting themselves to spread a knowledge of her 'public standards,' notwithstanding

all the sneers and censure which have been cast on this language; for *every intelligent and candid man in the community knows*, that we employ it to designate, not formularies which we place above the Bible, but merely those which ascertain and set forth how we interpret the Bible?" Nay, could it be that he intended to speak well of Popery in others, when he said, "our Episcopal brethren exercise a most laudable diligence in placing the volume which contains their articles, forms, and offices, in every family within their reach, which belongs to their communion, or can be considered as tending towards it: all this is as it should be; it bespeaks men sincere in their belief, and earnest in the dissemination of what they deem correct principles?"[1] "Nay," with her

[1] Neither was Dr. Milledoler at all afraid of Popery, when he gave utterance, like Dr. Miller, to these "words of truth and soberness:"

"Much recent altercation has taken place in the church, on the subject of creeds and confessions. It has not been unfrequently intimated, that narrow-hearted bigots have substituted them for the *Bible*, and have made them of equal, if not superior authority. It has also been, not obscurely, hinted, that it was time that they should be brushed away with the rubbish and traditions of former ages; and that men should drink their waters, immediately and solely, from the pure fountain head."

"Nothing has been so perverted by erring men, even in the plainest matters, as the Bible. No fancy, no folly, no downright contradiction to that sacred book, that imbecility or wickedness could invent; but has at one time or other been substituted for truth, and palmed upon the *Bible*.

"Is it to be wondered at, under these circumstances, that holy men of God, and learned in the Scriptures, have deemed it their duty, both in church council, and on their own responsibility, to draw up summaries of Christian doctrine in the form of catechisms or confessions.

"If these catechisms and confessions were really substituted for the Holy Scriptures, as has been said, they ought to be hurled without delay, without distinction, and without remorse, from the church of God. But is this the case? We answer, no—certainly it is not. Does not the whole Protestant world

(Rome) they hold that "the Church has ever been the *primary* source of faith.'"(76.) And is it Romish to say, that long before the Evangelists had written, Apostles, Elders and Deacons had preached, the Gospel? Was it Romish in St. Paul, to style "the Church of the living God" "the pillar and ground of the truth?" (1, Timothy iii, 15.) But "an inquirer 'must go first to the Church;' then, if he chooses" (the *if* is Mr. Boardman's own,) "to the Bible." (76.) And is not this the very ground on which St. Luke commended the Bereans as "more noble," "in that they received the word" spoken by Paul and Silas, "with all readiness of mind, and searched the Scriptures daily whether these things were so." But all this, to Mr. Boardman's eye, is "Oxford Tracts and Popery:" just as the wolf, (I believe it is Jeremy Taylor tells the story) who had learned to read; but, put together what letters soever he might, or in whatever order, he could not for his life make any thing out but L-A-M-B! And then, we have ever so much

---

read the Bible? Is it not almost the very first book that is put into the hands of our children? Do we not hear the voice of Christ, 'Search the Scriptures,' reiterated from church to church, throughout all Protestant Christendom?"

"What are our catechisms and confessions of faith, but systems of truth, professing to be drawn from the Bible? What is their test but the Bible? What is their appeal, but to the Bible? And in what is their worth, but in conformity to the Bible?"

"How shall two walk together, except they be agreed? Can we blend all principles and practices professed to be drawn from the holy oracles? Can we bind together materials the most discordant in the world, and then worship God in that discord? No, it cannot be. In essential things at least, men must see eye to eye, or they cannot comfortably be united in a church state."—*Concio ad Clerum*, at the opening of the General Synod of the Reformed Dutch Church in North America, pp. 11, 12, 13.

about Chillingworth's famous maxim, "the Bible and the Bible only, the religion of Protestants," which shall be noticed by and by: and a shameful thrust at holy Bishop Jebb, which shall be noticed now.[1]

---

[1] "Bible religion," says Mr. Boardman, speaking of the Oxford writers, "is an offence to those gentlemen. They 'cannot away with it.' It is too simple in its doctrines, its order, its worship. Hence we hear one who was as much the god-father, as Knox was the father, of the system, exclaiming; 'It is my wish and prayer, that I may be saved from the simplicity of Bible religion!' What a prayer for a Christian Bishop!"—Here were an end of Bishop Jebb, if Mr. Boardman had his way. *Actum est de illo.* But we move an arrest of judgment. What are the facts in the case? Bishop Jebb—against whom it is Mr. Boardman's distinguished honour to have cast *the first stone*—is writing to Mr. Knox. The first portion of the letter, how much we do not know, is omitted; as two lines of asterisks indicate. Then follow these sentences. "What you say about ———, is truly both melancholy and instructive. The good man himself will, I trust, be saved, though as through fire; but what wood, hay and stubble, may he not accumulate and vend? It is my wish and prayer, that I may be saved from *the simplicity of Bible religion.* Indeed, I believe, that in my very constitution I have some safeguard. I love system, antiquity and authority." Now, in the mind of any who knew, that Bishop Jebb, living and dead, was habitually known and spoken of as "the good Bishop of Limerick," this extract, even without an explanation, could occasion no distrust. "The lofty uncompromising, unswerving integrity, which never trifled with principle, in the veriest trifle; the noble disregard of every rule, but the rule of right; the generous disdain of every thing like meanness, in the guise of prudence; the free expenditure of money (looked on only as a means of doing good) on every thing which became a man, a gentleman and a Christian Bishop; the holiness of the life, the affectionate kindness of the heart, its warm, earnest, true piety, its thorough devotion to the cause of Christ's Church—who can tell these things as they ought to be told? These, however," said Hugh James Rose, who knew him well, "were things which belonged to his whole life." Not lightly would the evil, which Mr. Boardman means should be inferred from his quotation, be believed of such a man, even were there no possible solution of it. But what will the reader say, and where will Mr. Boardman hide his head, when, from the page nearest but two to that from which he quotes, we cite, in Mr. Knox's words, to which he was replying, the clear and perfect explanation? (It is Mr. Knox's 106th Letter, and is dated March 6, 1813, as Mr. Jebb's—he was not Bishop for ten years—was, March 8, 1813.)—"I thank you for giving me the exquisite epitaph, as well as for the accompanying passages. The latter I

And after all this, we are told so coolly, (p. 79.) "these writers it is true, do not adopt the Romish doctrine of the rule of faith *in all particulars!*"

The summary of "principles" "common to the two systems," which Mr. Boardman has drawn up, we leave to the protection of his saving clause, "as I understand them;" charitably hoping, that the fault lies there:[1] and hasten to conclude this portion of

---

might have relished more, had they not reminded me of that uncatholic doctrine of the intermediate sleep, the Socinians are so fond of; and which, to my sorrow unfeigned, my friend K———, has openly broached to his congregation at A———. This, I fear, is the beginning of troubles. I believe no one yet has held this opinion by itself; either Arianism or Socinianism, being hitherto its constant accompaniment; and to you, I say, that some such unhappy bewilderment, I expect, if I live, to witness, in that most amiable, but distressingly misled man. Painful as such an instance is, it conveys deep instruction. It shows that in that *simplicity of Bible religion*, which so many exclusively contend for, and so many more unconsciously strive to diffuse, there is no security for any man, however honest, however intentionally pious, being completely, himself, what he substantially now is, at any future period; suppose at twenty, fifteen, ten, or even seven years' end. Were there no resource against this versatility, the case of the religious world were deplorable. Yet sectarianism has no resource; as they who sail East or West, without a time-keeper, cannot tell where they are, so the honest sectarian, who is not content with the coasting movement of feeling, but launches into the sea of thought. 'Children tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine,' is the common character of them all, except when secured by a steady habit of mind, an unwinged ponderousness, which keeps its place, through an insuperable vis inertiæ."—Now grant the unpalatableness of these remarks of Mr. Knox—the more unpalatable for their home truth—to one in Mr. Boardman's position; what is there in Bishop Jebb's wish and prayer, taken in this connection, unsuited to a Christian Bishop? Why did not Mr. Boardman quote the whole of Bishop Jebb's own words? Why did he keep back the occasion which his correspondent, Mr. Knox, supplied him? Nay, why did he go out of his way, to bring in Bishop Jebb, at all? If this unworthy thrust at the grave of a dead saint has made me think of the hyena, I shall be pardoned, when I say, that in addition to the combination that was in him, of all that was pure, lovely and of good report, he was my kind, affectionate and faithful friend.

[1] "It is not here intended," says Bishop Taylor, "that the doctrine of the

the subject, by showing what is the teaching of the Tracts, as to the Rule of Faith; and how far it is from being Popery, or Popish. We have a personal concern in making this point clear: since never would we have used the name of Cranmer, Ridley, Latimer, or Jewel, as authorities, but as they built their conclusions upon the universal testimony of the earliest ages. Cranmer is nothing to us, as Cranmer. Ridley is nothing to us, as Ridley. Reformers, though they were, they still were nothing to us, as Reformers. Their weight and value lie entirely in the carefulness and honesty with which they went to the first fountains, and drank there. Had Luther, Calvin, Bucer done as they did, what reams of controversy had been unwritten! The only trouble in our case, is the infinite fulness of the subject, and the boundless sources which it opens.

What Oxford teaches, may be presented in few words, from Dr. Pusey's Letter.

"In brief, then, my Lord, the meaning of our Church (as we conceive) in these Articles is, that the Scripture is the sole authoritative source of the Faith, *i. e.* of 'things to be believed in order to salvation;' the Church is the medium through which that knowledge is conveyed to individuals; she, under her responsibility to God, and in subjection to His Scripture, and with the guidance of His Spirit, testifies to her children, what truths are necessary to be believed in order to salvation; expounds Scripture to them; determines, when controversies arise; and this, not in the character of a judge, but as a witness, to what she herself received."

Church should be the rule of faith distinctly from, much less against, the scripture; for that were a contradiction, to suppose the Church, and yet speaking and acting against the will of God; but it means, that where the question is concerning an obscure place of Scripture, the practice of the Catholic Church is the best Commentary."—vi, 524, Bishop Heber's Edition.

"And in this view of the meaning of our Church, we are further confirmed by the Canon of the Convocation of 1571, to which we have of late often had occasion to appeal; the same Convocation which enforced subscription to the Articles."

"'They [preachers] shall in the first place be careful never to teach any thing from the pulpit to be religiously held and believed by the people, but what is agreeable to the doctrine of the Old or New Testament, and *collected out of that very Doctrine by the Catholic Fathers and ancient Bishops.*'

"So have we ever wished to teach, 'what is agreeable to the Doctrine of the Old or New Testament:' and as the test of its being thus agreeable, we would take, not our own private and individual judgments, but that of the Universal Church, as attested by the 'Catholic Fathers and Ancient Bishops.'"

"Nor do we in this, nor did they, approximate to Romanism; but rather they herein took the strongest and the only unassailable position against it. Rome and ourselves have alike appealed to the authority of 'the Church;' but, in the mouth of a Romanist the Church means, so much of the Church as is in communion with herself, in other words, it means herself: with us, it means the Universal Church, to which Rome, as a particular Church, is subject, and ought to yield obedience. With Rome, it matters not whether the decision be of the Apostolic times, or of yesterday; whether against the teaching of the early Church, or with it; whether the whole Church universal throughout the world agree in it, or only a section, which holds communion with herself: she, as well as Calvin, makes much of the authority of the Fathers, when she thinks that they make for her; but she, equally with the founder of the Ultra-Protestants, sets at naught their authority, so soon as they tell against her: she unscrupulously sets aside the judgment of all the Ancient Doctors of the Church, unhesitatingly dismisses the necessity of agreement even of the whole Church at this day, and proudly taking to herself the exclusive title of Catholic, sits alone, a Queen in the midst of the earth, and dispenses her decrees from herself. No, my Lord! they ill understand the character of Rome, or their own strength, who think that she would really commit herself, as Cranmer did, to Christian Antiquity, or

who would not gladly bring her to that test! What need has she of Antiquity, who is herself infallible, except to allure mankind to believe her so?[1]—pp. 30, 31, 35, 36.

That this was the course pursued by our Reformers; that it is any thing but Popery; that it is the course of common sense and true philosophy, is what we now propose to show.

We call up Cranmer, Archbishop and Martyr;[2]

"Wherefore by your own description and rule of a Catholic faith, your doctrine and teaching in these four articles cannot be good and Catholic, except you can find it in plain terms in the Scripture, and *old Catholic doctors, which when you do, I will hold up my hand at the bar, and say guilty.* And if you cannot, then it is reason that you do the like, *per legem talionis*,"—*Answer to Gardyner. Works*, iii. 42.)

And again, among his last words;

"Touching my doctrine of the Sacrament, and other my doctrine, of what kind soever it be, I protest it was never my mind to write, speak, or understand any thing contrary to the most holy Word of God, *or else against the holy Catholic Church of* Christ, but purely and simply to imitate and teach those things only which I have learned from the sacred Scriptures, *and of the holy Catholic Church of* Christ *from the beginning, and also according to the exposition of the most holy and learned fathers and martyrs of the Church.*"

"And if any thing hath peradventure chanced otherwise than I thought, I may err; but heretic I cannot be, forasmuch as *I am ready in all things to follow the judgment of the most sacred Word of* God, *and of the holy Catholic Church*, desiring none other thing than meekly and gently to be taught, if anywhere (which God forbid) I have swerved from the truth.

---

[1] See Mr. Newman's Lecture on "Romanism as neglectful of Antiquity," and the whole of that admirable book, "The Prophetical Office of the Church."

[2] There would be no end of extracts from the Homilies to illustrate this point. The volume is referred to.

"And I profess and openly confess, that in all my doctrine and preaching, both of the Sacrament, and of other my doctrine whatsoever it be, not only *I mean and judge those things, as the Catholic Church and the most holy fathers of old with one accord have meant and judged*, but also I would gladly use the same words that they used, and not use any other words, but to set my hand to all and singular their speeches, phrases, ways, and forms of speech, which they do use in the treatises upon the Sacrament, *and to keep still their interpretation.* But in this thing I only am accused for a heretic, because I allow not the doctrine lately brought in of the Sacrament, and because I consent not to words not accustomed in Scripture and unknown to the ancient fathers, but newly invented and brought in by men, and tending to the destruction of souls, and overthrow of the old and pure religion."—*Appeal from the Pope to the next General Council. Works, vol.* iv. *pp.* 126, 127.

We call up Ridley, Bishop and Martyr;

"In that the Church of God is in doubt, I use herein the wise counsel of Vincentius Lirinensis, whom I am sure you will allow, who, giving precepts how the Catholic Church may be known in all schisms and heresies, writeth in this manner: 'When,' saith he, 'one part is corrupted with heresies, then prefer the whole world before that one part; but if the greater part be infected then prefer antiquity.' In like sort, now, when I perceive the greatest part of Christianity to be infected with the poison of the See of Rome, I repair to the usage of the Primitive Church;[1] which I find clear contrary to the Pope's decrees, as in that the priest receiveth alone, that it is made unlawful to the laity to receive in both kinds, and such like, wherefore it requireth, that *I prefer the antiquity of the primitive church, before the novelty of the Church of Rome.*"[2]—Life. pp. 613, 614.

We call up Bradford, Presbyter and Martyr;

"To believe as the Word of God teacheth, *the primitive Church*

---

[1] It was his thorough acquaintance with antiquity that recommended Ridley in the first instance to Cranmer.—*Soames' Reformation*, iii. 26.

[2] Those who would know thoroughly what this means, are referred to Dr. Hook's noble sermon, "The Novelties of Romanism."

believed, and all the Catholic and good holy fathers taught for five hundred years at least after Christ, will not serve, and therefore I am condemned and burned, out of hand.—*Martyrs' Letters, p.* 270.

We call up Bishop Jewell;

"The words that I then spake, as near as I can call them to mind, were these: If any learned man of all our adversaries, or if all the learned men that be alive, be able to bring *any one sufficient sentence out of any old Catholic Doctor, or Father, or out of any old general Council*, or out of the Holy Scriptures of God, or any one example of the primitive Church, whereby it may be clearly and plainly proved, that there was any private mass in the whole world at that time, for the space of six hundred years after Christ; or that there was then any communion ministered unto the people under one kind; or that the people had their common prayers then in a strange tongue, that they understood not: or that the Bishop of Rome was then called an universal Bishop, or the head of the universal Church, &c.; if any man alive were able to prove any of these articles, by any one clear or plain clause or sentence, either of the Scriptures or of the old Doctors, or of any old general Council, or by any example of the primitive Church: I promised then that I would give over and subscribe unto him."

"Thus have we been taught by Christ, the apostles, and *by the holy Fathers*, and we do faithfully teach the children of God the same things, and for so doing are we to be called heretics by their great high priests? Oh! immortal God! Have Christ and his apostles, and *so many fathers*, all erred? What, are Origen, Ambrose, Augustine, Chrysostom, Gelasius, and Theodoret, apostates from the Catholic faith? Was the consent of so many bishops and learned men nothing but a conspiracy of heretics? Or that which was commendable in them, is it now blameable in us? Or that which was once true, is it now, because it displeaseth them, become false?" —*Sermon*, preached at St. Paul's Cross.

We call up Bishop Cheney;

"These new writers in matters of controversy, as Mr. Calvin and others, agree not together, but are at dissension among themselves, and are together by the ears. Therefore take heed of them. Yet

read them: for in opening the text, they do pass many of the old fathers. And they are excellently well learned in the tongues: but in matters now in controversy follow them not, but follow *the old fathers and doctors*, although Mr. Calvin denieth some of them. 'Scriptures, Scriptures,' do you cry? Be not too hasty: for so the heretics always cried, and had the Scriptures. I would ask this question; I have to do with an heretic; I bring Scripture against him; and he will confess it to be Scripture. But he will deny the sense that I bring it for. How now? How shall this be tried? *Marry, by consent of Fathers only, and not by others.* Good people, I must now depart shortly. Keep, therefore, this lesson with you. Believe not, neither follow this city, nor yet 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7; but follow you *the Catholic and universal consent.*"—*Strype's Annals*, i. *pt.* 2, *pp.* 278–280.

We call up Bishop Hall;

"In truth, he who sincerely subscribes to the word of God, consigned, as it is, to the everlasting record of letters, to all the primitive creeds, to the four general councils, to the concordant judgment of the Fathers for the first six hundred years from Christ, which we of the Reformed Church religiously profess to do, even though he be not exempt from error in minor points, yet he shall never be an heretic. Any particular church may easily err, by affixing heresy to an opinion undeserving of it, whether a truth or a light error; but heavily neither soul nor church can err, which walks heedfully in the steps of the universal and ancient Church.—*Concio ad Clerum*, 1623.

We call up Archbishop Potter;

"I must not forget under this head, that I am again charged not only with favouring Popery, but with being a Papist in disguise, with acknowledging the Protestant principles for decency's sake, but steadfastly adhering to the Popish. And all this, it seems, for having referred you to the practice and writers of the Primitive times, and of the next ages after the Apostles; whereby I am represented to understand the reign of Constantine, which happened as he (the objector) saith, almost 300 years after. Now I am not in the least apprehensive of my being suspected as a favourer of Popery by any

man *who knows the true meaning of Popery;* but sure it is such a compliment to the Popish religion, as no Protestant would have made who understands his own principles, to date its rise from the time of Constantine; the claim of Infallibility, and of the Papal Supremacy as now exercised, the doctrine of Transubstantiation, Invocation of Saints, Image worship, prayers in an unknown tongue, forbidding laymen to read the Scriptures, to say nothing of other peculiar tenets of the Church of Rome, having never been heard of during the reign of this great Emperor, or for a long time after; as a very little insight into the Popish controversies, or Ecclesiastical historians would have informed the writer. It would have been much more to his purpose, and equally consistent with truth and justice, to have told his readers, that by the next ages after the Apostles, I meant the times immediately preceding the Reformation; but then one opportunity would have been lost of declaiming against the times in which the Nicene Creed was composed, and Arianism condemned. As to the primitive writers, *I am not ashamed or afraid to repeat*, that the *best method of interpreting Scripture, seems to me to be the having recourse to the writers who lived nearest to the times wherein the Scriptures were first published*, that is, to the next ages after the Apostles; and that *a diligent inquiry into the faith of the Church in the same ages, would be the most effectual way, next after the study of the Scriptures, to prevent innovations in doctrine;* and lastly, that this hath been practised with great success, by some of our best advocates for the Protestant cause, as Bishop Jewel for example, Archbishop Laud, Archbishop Usher, Bishop Cosin, Bishop Stillingfleet, Dr. Barrow, Bishop Bull, with many others at home and abroad."—*Charge to the Clergy of the Diocese of Oxford.*

We call up Chillingworth;

"Neither is that true which you pretend, that we possess the Scripture from you, or take it upon the integrity of your custody, but upon *universal tradition*, of which you [Rome] are but a little part."—*Works*, (Oxford) i. 159.

And again;

"If there be any *traditive interpretation* of Scripture, produce it, and prove it to be so, and we embrace it. But the tradition of all

ages is one thing; and the authority of the present Church, much more of the Roman Church, which is but a part, and a corrupted part, of the Catholic Church, is another. And therefore, though *we are ready for both Scripture, and the sense of Scripture, upon the authority of original tradition*, yet we receive neither the one nor the other upon the authority of your Church." 218.

And again;

"Methinks so subtil a man as you are should easily apprehend a wide difference between authority to do a thing, and infallibility in doing it; and again, between a conditional infallibility, and an absolute. *The former*, the Doctor,[1] together with *the Church of England*, attributeth to the Church, nay, to particular Churches, *and I subscribe to his opinion;* that is, an authority of determining controversies of faith according to plain and EVIDENT SCRIPTURE, AND UNIVERSAL TRADITION, and *infallibility, while they proceed according to this rule.*" 276, 7.

And again;

"He that pretends to believe in God, obligeth himself to believe it necessary to obey that which reason assures him to be the will of God. Now reason will assure him that believes the Creed, that it is the will of God he should believe the Scripture; even the very same reason which moves him to believe the Creed; *universal and never-failing tradition* having given this testimony both to *Creed and Scripture*, that they *both*, by the works of God, were sealed, and testified to be the words of God." ii. 36.

And again;

"To the third, I answer, that the certainty I have of the Creed, that it was from the Apostles, and contains the principles of faith, I ground it *not upon Scripture*, and yet *not upon the infallibility of any* present, much less upon your Church; but *upon the authority of the ancient Church, and written tradition*, which, (as Dr. Potter hath proved,) gave this constant testimony unto it." p. 37.

And again;

"And moreover, to clear myself, once for all, from all imputations

---

[1] Dr. Potter.

of this nature, which charge me injuriously with denial of supernatural verities, I profess sincerely that I believe all those books of Scripture which the Church of England accounts canonical, to be the infallible word of God. I believe all things evidently contained in them; all things evidently, or even probably deducible from them; I acknowledge all that to be heresy, which, by the act of Parliament, *primo* of Queen Elizabeth, is declared to be so;[1] and *though in such points, which may be held diversely by divers men,*[2] SALVA FIDEI COMPAGE, I would not *take any man's liberty from him*, and humbly beseech all men that they would not take mine from me; yet, thus much I can say, (which, I hope, will satisfy any man of reason,) that whatsoever hath been held necessary to salvation, either *by the Catholic Church of all ages; or by the consent of the Fathers, measured by Vincentius Lirinensis'* rule, or is held necessary, either by the Catholic Church of this age, or by the consent of Protestants, or even by the Church of England, that, against the Socinians, and all others whatever, I do verily believe and embrace." i. 28, 9.

And again;

"I beseech you, pardon me if I choose *mine* [the foundation of my faith] upon one that is much firmer and safer, and lies open to none of these objections, which is SCRIPTURE AND UNIVERSAL TRADITION.—ii. 498.

And again;

* * * * "Divers ways, the doctors of *your* Church [of Rome] do the principal and proper work of the Socinians for them, undermining the doctrine of the Trinity, by denying it to be supported by

[1] The rule given in the Act is the Canonical Scriptures, and the four first General Councils.

[2] Of this Catholic liberty of interpretation, which pervades the teaching of the Church, and is indeed the ground-work of it all, Mr. Boardman, of course, can form no comprehension. In the straitness of his sect, a man must say "Shibboleth," not "Sibboleth;" or he is taken, and slain. Hence, a man becomes an enemy for a word. Hence divisions without end or sense. As one tells of that dispute between the famous Puritanical leaders, Ainsworth and Broughton, whether the colour of Aaron's linen ephod was of a blue, or a sea-water green; which threw their followers into parties and factions, and puzzled all the dyers of Amsterdam.

those pillars of the faith, which alone are fit and able to support it. I mean SCRIPTURE, and the CONSENT OF THE ANCIENT DOCTORS."[1] i. p. 18.

We call up Mr. Faber, and with him a host of witnesses;

"Renouncing the self-sufficient licentiousness of that miscalled and misapprehended right of private judgment, which dogmatically pronounces upon the *meaning* of Scripture from a mere insulated *inspection* of Scripture, and which rapidly decides that such *must* be the sense of Scripture, because an individual *thinks* that such *is* the sense of Scripture: renouncing this self-sufficient and strangely unsatisfactory licentiousness, the Church of England, with her usual sober and modest judiciousness, has always professed to build her code of doctrine, *authoritatively*, indeed, upon SCRIPTURE ALONE, but *hermeneutically* upon *Scripture, as understood and explained by primitive antiquity.*

"Herein she has judged well and wisely.

"*Scripture and Antiquity are the two pillars upon which all rationally established faith must ultimately repose.*

"If we reject Scripture, we reject the very basis of theological belief. If we reject Antiquity, we reject all historical evidence of soundness of interpretation.

"When in our inquiries after revealed truth the two are combined, we attain to moral certainty: and in matters which by their very nature admit not of mathematical proof, *moral certainty* is the highest point to which we can possibly attain."—*Primitive Doctrine of Election*, pp. 11, 13.

Again, he says, in another place;

"Among unread or half-read persons of our somewhat confident age, it is a not uncommon saying: That THEY *disregard the early Fathers:* and that THEY *will abide by nothing save the decision of Scripture alone.*

"If by *a disregard of the early Fathers* they mean that they

---

[1] No one has shown more conclusively how regardless Rome is of "the consent of the ancient Doctors," than Mr. Newman, in his "Romanism and Popular Protestantism."

allow them not individually that personal authority in exposition which the Romanists claim for them, they certainly will not have *me*, at least, for an opponent: and, accordingly, I have shown that, in the interpretation of the Scripture terms *Election* and *Predestination*, I regard the insulated individual authority of Augustine, just as little as I regard the insulated individual authority of Calvin.

"But, if, by *a disregard of the early Fathers*, they mean that they regard them not as evidence to the FACT of *what* doctrines were or were not received by the Primitive Church, and from her were or were not delivered to posterity; they might just as rationally talk of the surpassing wisdom of extinguishing the light of history by way of more effectually improving and increasing our knowledge of past events; for, in truth, under the aspect in which they are specially important to *us*, the early Fathers are neither more nor less than so many historical witnesses.

"Again: if, by *an abiding solely by the decision of Scripture*, they mean that, as a binding or authoritative rule of faith, they will receive nothing save what is contained in Scripture; no person, I suppose, who rejects that idle supplemental tradition which the Council of Trent invites us to receive with the *same* confidence as Holy Scripture itself, will think of differing from them: for the Bible, and the Bible alone, is doubtless the rule of faith with all Protestants.

"But, if, by *an abiding solely by the decision of Scripture*, they mean that, utterly disregarding the recorded doctrinal system of that primitive Church which conversed with and was taught by the apostles, they will abide by nothing save their own crude and arbitrary private expositions of Scripture; we certainly may well admire their intrepidity, whatever we may think of their modesty: for, in truth, by such a plan, while they call upon us to despise the sentiments of Christian antiquity so far as we can learn them upon distinct historical testimony, they expect us to receive without hesitation, and as undoubted verities, *their own* mere modern upstart speculations upon the sense of God's holy word; that is to say, the evidence of the early Fathers and the hermeneutic decisions of the primitive Church we may laudably and profitably contemn, but *themselves* we must receive (for they themselves are content to receive themselves) as well nigh certain and infallible expositors of Scripture."—*Ibid* p. 184.

And again;

"Against the ancient fathers and the early Church, a succession of charges, both negative and positive, has lately been brought by an ingenious author[1] who does not give his name.

"In their teaching, it seems, they omitted the weightier matters of the Gospel, and occupied themselves, not very profitably, in gnosticising upon the virtues of celibacy, in lauding the potent meritoriousness of fasting, in prominently exhibiting the benefits attendant upon the invocation of dead saints, and in determinately mystifying the sacraments, until those divine ordinances assume the suspicious colour of the veritable Romish *opus operatum.*

"The professed object of these charges is to aim a blow at the well known 'Oxford Tracts for the times.' I do not quite clearly understand the author's chronology: for, though his special attack is upon what he calls the *Nicene Church*, meaning I suppose, the Church subsequent to the first Council of Nice; yet, in search of his materials, he seems inclined to travel back well nigh, if not altogether, to the apostolic times. Had he distinctly *limited* the term of his attack to the fourth and fifth centuries, a very fair argument, on Tertullian's just principle that *every doctrinal innovation is a palpable adulteration*, would have been brought against the Tract writers; but if he means to carry up his censures to the *strictly* Primitive Church which conversed with the Apostles, I should think, on the principles of historical testimony, PROVIDED his case could be *evidentially* established, that the gentlemen of the Tract school will hold themselves obliged to him for consolidating a much stronger argument in their favour than I have as yet chanced to encounter.

"However this may be, I here mention the work, simply lest it should be eagerly caught up, by some strenuous misopaterist, as stultifying the *legitimate* principle of an appeal to antiquity.

"Agreeably to the wise recommendation of the Anglican Church,[2] we, who are her dutiful sons, appeal, in the way of *evidence* not to this father or to that father, but to the entire succession of the fathers from the very beginning: and, furthermore we appeal to such ab-

---

[1] Mr. Faber refers to Mr. Isaac Taylor, and his book, "Ancient Christianity."

[2] "Let them, in the first place, take care that they never teach any thing in sermons, which they would have the people hold and believe, but what is agree-

original succession, not for the purpose of imposing upon the faithful matters unscriptural or extra-scriptural, but in order to ascertain, through their *harmonious testimony*, what was ALWAYS the catholic received sense of doctrinal Scripture; inasmuch as our very principle, in direct opposition to the spurious Tridentine principle, is a *strict limitation* of our appeal to the evidential ascertainment of the true apostolical sense of doctrinal Scripture *only*.

Now, whatever gratuitous absurdities may have been personally advocated by the fathers as we descend the stream of chronology, and whatever unscriptural notions may have been by them heaped upon sound catholic doctrines, this cannot affect their unanimous TESTIMONY to the *universal reception of really Scriptural doctrines from the very beginning*.

"Let *all* the fathers, if the author means to include them *all*, gnosticise ever so copiously on fasting and celibacy; or let them, with the Roman Clement unexpectedly at their head, labour ever so perseveringly to obscure and overlay the sincere Gospel by mystifying the sacraments, and by invocating the saints: must we say, that *therefore* they become, henceforth and for ever, quite useless and incompetent WITNESSES, as to whether the Catholic Church, from the time of its foundation, universally held, or universally denied, the doctrines of the Trinity, and Christ's Godhead and the atonement, and many others, which, correctly or incorrectly in the abstract, are yet all professedly deduced from *Scripture?*

"Truly, we might just as reasonably maintain, that those grave clerks who, in the days of good King James, devoutly believed in witchcraft, were *therefore* incompetent WITNESSES to the real quality of the doctrinal system professedly deduced from *Scripture* by the Reformed Church of England.—*Primitive Doctrine of Regeneration.*

And again;

It will be observed, that the writers of this Homily[1] appeal in the way of evidential confirmation of their doctrine, to the early Fathers. In this, they exemplify the sound principle of the Church of Eng-

---

able to the doctrine of the old and New Testaments, and which the catholic fathers and ancient bishops have collected from that very doctrine."—*Vide Canons of* 1571.

[1] He is alluding to the Sermon of the salvation of mankind.

land; the principle of Cranmer and of Ridley, of Jewell and of Hooker, of Pearson and of Beveridge: that *Scripture is the Sole Rule of Faith;* but that, *Since no Rule can be used as a Rule until it be first interpreted, we must resort for its interpretation, not to the wantonness of our own arbitrary dogmatism, but to the ascertained general consent of the Primitive Church.*

For, since it is quite clear that the Bible cannot be used as a Rule of Faith until it be interpreted, they, who profess to honour its autocracy by despising the interpretations of the Fathers, most unaccountably seem not to perceive; that, while they profess to appeal to *the Bible alone*, they *really* appeal only to *their own private interpretations*, rather than to *the interpretations of the early Church:* and, how it can be said by any modern, that an appeal to the interpretation of the Fathers is an appeal *from* the authority of the Bible *to* mere human authority, while an appeal to this same modern's *own* interpretation is NOT an appeal *from* the authority of the Bible *to* mere human authority; surpasses my own power of comprehension. In truth I see not, how such an assertion can for a moment be sustained: unless the modern in question be prepared, with a grave face, to maintain; that *his* interpretation of the Bible is NOT a human interpretation.

We have seen, how the English Church speaks in her nineteenth canon;[1] and we have noted, how, in the matter of Justification, she appeals to Ecclesiastical Antiquity: let us now hear, how Bishop Jewell expounds her sentiments, and how the great Casaubon understood them.

These doctrines have we learned, from Christ, from the Apostles, and from the holy Fathers: and the same, with all good faith, we teach to the people of God.—Juell. Apol. Eccles. Anglican. apud Enchir. Theol. vol. i. p. 228.

From the Primitive Church, from the Apostles, from Christ we have not departed.—Ibid. p. 295.

We have resorted, as much as we possibly could, to the Church of the Apostles and of the ancient Catholic Bishops and Fathers: and we have carefully directed, to their rites and institutes, not only our Doctrinal System, but also our Sacraments and the

[1] See the Canon of 1571, in the note, pages 141, 2.

Form of our Public Prayers. For we judged, that we ought to take our commencement from that precise quarter, whence the first beginnings of Religion were derived.—Ibid. p. 323.

From Holy Scripture, which we know to be infallible, we have sought out a certain sure form of Religion: and we have returned to the Primitive Church of the Ancient Fathers and Apostles, that is to say, to the very rudiments and beginnings, and, as it were, to the very fountains.—Ibid. p. 340.

I could wish, with Melancthon and the Church of England, that our articles of faith should be derived, from the fountain of Holy Scripture, through the channel of Antiquity. Otherwise, what end will there be of perpetual innovation?—Casaub. Epist. 744.

If I am not greatly mistaken, the soundest part of the whole Reformation is to be found in England: for there, along with the study of Essential Truth, flourishes also the study of Antiquity. —Ibid. Epist. 837.[1]

The King and the whole Church of England pronounce: that they acknowledge, for true, and at the same time necessary to salvation, that doctrine alone, which, welling out from the fountain of Holy Scripture, has been derived, through the consent of the Ancient Church, as through a channel, down to these present times.—Ibid. Epist. 838.

Thus rationally and soberly theologises the truly Apostolic Church of England: and those moderns know little either of her principles or of her practice, who would expose her, to the not unmerited scoffs of such writers as Dr. Wiseman and his Romish brethren, by exhibiting her as the advocate of *all the wildness of insulated and uninformed private judgment;* as if she made every man, qualified or unqualified, his own prophet and his own church. Truly, in the hands of such a company of preachers, the City of God would indeed become a Babel, a City of confusion! The English Church says to her children: *Qualify* yourselves; and *then* judge, upon the intelligible principles of adequate testimony, whether I indeed declare unto you the mind of Scripture. But, *without* qualification,

[1] This passage of Casaubon is the motto of an admirable Tract, by excellent Bishop Jebb, on the System of Interpretation as held and practised in the Church of England, which should by all means be re-printed here.

what can your mere insulated private judgment be worth? If you either cannot, or will not, qualify yourselves: your judgment must, as plain common sense teaches, lie in abeyance. In that case, just as you depend upon your lawyer or your physician, so must you be even content to depend upon my decisions. Meanwhile, fancy not, that I have the slightest wish to hoodwink you, or to exact the blind submission demanded by the Romish Priesthood. I simply say: *Qualify yourselves; and then, like reasonable beings, exercise your right of private judgment.* I no more deny your *right* of judging for yourselves in Theology, than I deny your *right* of prescribing for yourselves in Medicine. But, as I suppose you would scarcely undertake to be your own Physicians without study: so, I think, you will act not much more wisely or much more safely, if you determine to become your own Theologians, purely by force of instinct, and without any adequate preparation.

"So, I apprehend, speaks the Anglican Church: and I really cannot discern any absurdity in her language. Unless I greatly mistake, the DIRECT purpose of that Church, in her godly work of self-reformation, was not so much *to run counter to the Church of Rome*, as *to return to the Catholic Church of Primitive Antiquity*. From this purpose sprang, no doubt, her protest against the Roman Church: nor, in the way of cause and effect, could it well be otherwise. But, still, *her censure of Rome*, however just, was the INCIDENT only: *her return to Catholic Antiquity* was the PRINCIPLE.

"Let her PRINCIPLE of reformation, only, be borne in mind: and her PRACTICE will be at once, perfectly intelligible and perfectly consistent. She determinately wished, as Casaubon speaks, to acknowledge alone that Doctrinal System, which, welling out from the fountain of Holy Scripture, has been derived, down to the present time, through the consent of the Ancient Church, as through a channel. And, accordingly, on this precise ground, the same eminent person pronounces *her* Scheme of reformation to be the soundest of *all* the Schemes that were severally adopted by the Reformers. It received from him that honourable and glorious character, BECAUSE, within her hallowed walls, along with the devout study of Essential Truth, flourished also the diligent study of Antiquity. Whenever, under the vain upstart plea of *insulated* and *independent* and *uninformed* private judgment, the Church of England shall depart from the com-

plexity of her own recognised mode of theologising, *Ichabod* will be written in characters of fire upon her recreant forehead. She will have quitted the path of Cranmer and our wise Reformers: and she will be on the high-road to every evil imagination. Like a ship without a rudder, she will be carried about by each wind of doctrine, whatever may be the fashionable humour of the day: and the obvious reason is, because, in such a supposed case, she has forsaken the stedfastness of testimony, the *Quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus;* and has trusted to her own vain and unauthorised hallucinations. Perhaps it might be useful to inquire, whether the plague has not already gone forth among us; whether, in the pride of our high speculations, we are not, even now, in our irreverent dealing with God's Word, too frequently building upon the independent sufficiency of our own unaided hermeneutic powers; whether in the stubborn self-conceit of our own insulated knowledge, we are not, too many of us, among those, whose language is, *We are they, and wisdom will die with us:* but I forbear; and, with real feelings of Christian anxiety when I behold the facility with which strange doctrines are disseminated and received among us, leave the consideration of these matters to those whom they may concern. Suffice it to say, that this spirit of arrogant self-sufficiency and inflated self-dependence, in the work of Scriptural Interpretation, is the very spirit of high-vaulting Socinianism. The pretence is, *an honouring of the Bible:* the reality is, *an overweening estimate of ourselves.*" —*Primitive Doctrine of Justification*, pp. 52, 3.

But if any one would see this subject treated with a master's hand, let him read the appendix to Archdeacon Manning's noble Sermon, "The Rule of Faith:" in which the practice of the Church of England is discriminated from that of Rome, and of the modern school; and the two latter shown to come together in result, with such luminousness of statement and conclusiveness of reasoning, that any one, with half an eye, can see it. Gladly would I give it all. Reluctantly do I confine myself to two single extracts

from his eloquent conclusion. "Ex pede Herculem.'

"The great and true definition of natural philosophy, as we have it on the high authority of Lord Bacon, is the 'questioning of nature,' and the only sure rule is the deducing of conclusions from facts first gathered from the external world. The great universal laws of the material world, and the universal instincts of animate nature, are parallel to the universal tradition of revealed truth. Universal tradition is the evidence of an induction formed on the basis of all Christendom; and surely *they* must fall out with philosophy who reject it. Again, if this outward authority be of God, the most docile submission is the highest grace. It is assumption of supremacy on earth, and of freedom from all controlling authority in religion, that makes the Church of Rome and the modern school unteachable and wilful. The moral habits are the same; and hence comes all the kindred temptations to an evil disposition of mind. Self-confidence, a self-ordained infallibility, pertinacious tenacity of argument, readiness to accuse, rashness in denouncing, exclusiveness, a warped judgment, all these are the besetting dangers of our times; and so they ever must be until we all honestly submit to something out of ourselves, against whose decision we may make no further appeal."

"And, lastly, the habit of looking out of ourselves and of submitting to an external witness of God's appointment, has a direct tendency to deepen and confirm the devotional energies of the mind. It is not true, that they who reject universal tradition *can* wholly look out of themselves. Holy Scripture is indeed an external witness to which they believe themselves to bow; but it is Scripture *understood in their own sense;* and therefore, after all, *it returns unto themselves again.* Universal tradition makes the *sense* external too. Apostles, prophets, martyrs, doctors, and saints of old, gathered into one glorious fellowship, lose each their several forms and features of distinctness; they pass from our sight in the brightness which a miraculous consent of all Churches, and of all ages, sheds upon us: all that we behold is as it were the skirts of His glory, that lighteth every man that cometh into the world. We listen not to them, but to HIM, before whom let all the earth keep silence." pp. 134, 136.

Thus have we finished, at much greater length

than we at first intended—though not too great for the importance, or the interest, of the subject—the Brief Examination, which was proposed, of Mr. Boardman's attempt to prove his charge, that "a large and learned body of the Clergy" of the Church of England "have returned to some of the worst errors of Popery." An Examination, which would have been brief indeed, had he been held to the true issue; and not permitted to make the parenthesis of more importance than the sentence which included it. But no well-wisher to the truth will for a moment grudge the time or space which has been occupied—chiefly with extracts from the Oxford writers, and with authorities, to show how far they are from Popery—in this examination: as no serious person will be found, that will not blush, even upon this acquaintance with them, that a "Pastor" could be found, who would compare their pages to the Koran, or the works of Belsham, or of Channing. The honest reader will see why the publication, first, and then the reading, of the Oxford Tracts has been so violently opposed, and so unsparingly denounced. Let him bless God, that what Dr. Hook well calls "the Popery of Ultra Protestantism" cannot control the press, nor even establish an Expurgatory Index!

For his second undertaking, to cast the suspicion of Popery on the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America, without even the show of proof, the "word or two," of which the title page gives promise, will abundantly suffice. What says the Call for Proof?

Your reference to the state of things in this country is more

guarded. By "the Oxford Tract leaven," however, I must suppose you to mean, from the connection in which you use it, the adoption of "some of the worst errors of Popery:" more especially as you state that the "Roman Priests are publicly felicitating their people on the progress their doctrines are making in the bosom of a Protestant Church;" by which you mean, doubtless, the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America. Adopting this interpretation of your language, I call on you distinctly, and by name, for your proofs of *the adoption of "some of the worst errors of Popery" into "the bosom" of that Church; and of the progress in it of any "doctrines," which, in your judgment, would justly authorise the "Roman Priests," as such, in really, as well as "publicly, felicitating their people."* I say, *really;* for I am sure you are not ignorant of the devices of Popery; how she adapts herself to times and circumstances, taking cameleon-like the hue of every hour, yet all the while, in purpose and intent, unchanging and unchangeable; how skilful and how prompt she is in that old trick of tyrants, to divide and conquer; nay, how she has put on the very face and garb of Puritanism, that she might undermine what she most dreads and hates, the Church of England, and the truth as held by her.

Is there an attempt to meet it? First, (p. 82) comes a feeble effort to deny the justice of the limitation of his evidence, from Popish exultation, to such as in his conscience, he believed, was honest. How this told upon the Papists, the reference to the "Catholic Herald," on the 16th page, will show. Mr. Boardman finds it convenient to put himself upon his dignity, presuming that his word is "a sufficient voucher for it!" The fact was not denied, without his word. The question asked was, How much is it worth? Judged by the test of Popish praise, or the reverse, "Boardman and Sparry" are more to be suspected now than "Bishop Doane." Such, were he living yet, would be the judgment of no less a man than Chillingworth. See how he dealt with

the same trick of Popery, in his own days. It will help to illustrate Solomon's meaning, when he says, "There is no new thing under the sun."

"The other part of your accusation strikes deeper, and is more considerable; and that tells us, that 'Protestantism waxeth weary of itself; that the professors of it, they especially of greatest worth, learning and authority, love temper and moderation; and are at this time more unresolved where to fasten, than at the infancy of their Church; that their Churches begin to look with a new face; their walls to speak a new language; their doctrine to be altered in many things, for which their progenitors forsook the then visible church of Christ; for example, the pope not antichrist, prayer for the dead; *limbus patrum;* pictures; that the Church hath authority in determining controversies of faith, and to interpret Scripture about free-will, predestination, universal grace; that all our works are not sins; merit of good works; inherent justice; faith alone doth not justify; charity to be preferred before knowledge; traditions; commandments possible to be kept; that their Thirty-nine Articles are patient, nay, ambitious, of some sense wherein they may seem Catholic; that to allege the necessity of wife and children, in these days, is but a weak plea, for a married minister to compass a benefice; that Calvinism is at length accounted heresy, and little less than treason; that men in talk and writing use willingly the once fearful names of priests and altars; that they are now put in mind, that for exposition of Scripture, they are by Canon bound to follow the Fathers; which, if they do with sincerity, it is easy to tell what doom will pass against Protestants, seeing that by confession of Protestants, the Fathers are on the Papists' side, which the answerer to some so clearly demonstrated that they remain convinced;' in fine, as the Samaritans saw in the disciples' countenances, that they meant to go to Jerusalem, so you pretend it is even legible in the foreheads of these men, that they are even going, nay, making haste to Rome: which scurrilous libel, void of all truth, discretion and honesty, what effect it may have wrought, what aid it may have gained with credulous Papists (who dream what they desire, and believe their own dreams,) or with ill-affected, jealous, and weak Protestants I cannot tell; but one thing I dare say boldly, that *you yourself did never believe it.*

"For, *did you indeed conceive, or had you any hope, that such men as you describe, men of worth, of learning and authority too, were friends and favourers of your religion, and inclinable to your party, can any man imagine that you would proclaim it, and bid the world take heed of them?* Sic notus Ulysses? *Do we know the Jesuits no better than so?* What! are they turned prevaricators against their own faction? Are they likely men to betray and expose their own agents and instruments, and to awaken the eyes of jealousy, and to raise the clamour of the people against them. Certainly your zeal to the See of Rome, testified by your fourth vow of special obedience to the Pope, proper to your order, and your cunning carriage of all affairs for the greater advantage and advancement of that See, are clear demonstrations, that *if you had thought thus, you would never have said so. The truth is*, they that can run to extremes, in opposition against you; *they that pull down your infallibility and set up their own; they that declaim against your tyranny, and exercise it themselves over others; are the adversaries that give you greatest advantage, and such as you love to deal with.* Whereas, upon men of temper and moderation, such as will oppose nothing because you maintain it, but will draw as near to you (that they may draw you to them) as the truth will let them; such as require of Christians to believe only in Christ, and will damn no man or doctrine without express and certain warrant from God's word; upon such as these you know not how to fasten; but if you chance to have conference with any such (which yet as much as possibly you can, you avoid and decline) you are very speedily put to silence, and see the indefensible weakness of your cause laid open to all men. And this I verily believe, is the true reason that you thus rave and rage against them; as foreseeing your time of prevailing, or even of subsisting, would be short, if other adversaries will give you no more advantage than they do."—*Works*, Priestly's Edition, iii, 47—49.

Next, we have, what professes to come to "the merits of the case;" and, yet, is but a poor evasion. "The whole question," Mr. Boardman says, "resolves itself into this, viz: whether the Oxford system, as a system,

has made any progress in our cities? If it has, then, on the supposition that it is strongly imbued with Popery," (a point already examined) "the Popery in it has made progress also." But Mr. Boardman must not be allowed to dispose of his own words, even by eating them. He said, "the Oxford Tract leaven is already beginning to work in our cities." He added, "and ROMAN PRIESTS are publicly felicitating themselves on the progress THEIR DOCTRINES are making IN THE BOSOM of a Protestant Church." If this latter clause means just what the former does, it was at least superfluous. But it means much more. The "doctrines" of "Roman Priests" can mean but POPERY: not Popery suspected, not even Popery in progress; but Popery itself, "some of the worst errors of Popery." Neither must "the bosom of a Protestant Church" be explained away, to mean "the cities." The country, too, we humbly trust, shares in the shelter of her blessed bosom, who is the mother of us all. The simple truth is, Mr. Boardman's words clearly do "cast the suspicion of Popery," and this is a mild phrase to use, "on the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America." If he claims that such was not his meaning, that is one thing. When he does so, we shall advise him to be more careful, the next time he deals with such high matters, to say what he does mean. Meanwhile, the appearance is, that these harsh words were meant to do their work in quarters, where the truth might never come. He did not expect to be called on for Proof.

And what, in the name of law and logic, does the Proof, when brought, amount to? Five or six pages

filled with extracts from "The Churchman," a paper published in the city of New York, the Editor of which, is quite able to speak on all occasions for himself; the whole mass of which would amount to nothing at all, even if the Churchman were the authentic organ of the whole American Church, (which it is not of any portion of it:) and "a single fact," "respectfully" commended to attention and duly *italicised*—"I know of an instance in which a family of the highest respectability *have been converted to Popery, chiefly by the reading of the Oxford publications.*" Verily, the labouring mountain has brought forth a mouse! Because the paper, called "the Churchman," contains certain original communications, and extracts from British Journals, which Mr. Boardman partly does not understand, and partly does not like—perhaps on account of "the summary disposal" made of all non-Episcopalians; and because the Editor of the Churchman not only gives a "laudatory notice" of Dr. Pusey's Treatise on Baptism, but even ventures to express the judgment, (which Isaac Taylor uttered long before) that "every suspicion, even of a tendency to Romanism in the Oxford divines, is removed;" and because, moreover, to Mr. Boardman's certain knowledge, "a family *of the highest respectability*, have been converted to Popery, CHIEFLY by the reading of the Oxford publications," THEREFORE,[1] "Roman Priests are publicly

[1] "King James, it is well known, ascribed to Hooker, more than to any other writer, his own ill-starred conversion to Romanism: against which, nevertheless, if he had thought a little more impartially, he might have perceived that Hooker's works every where inculcate that which is the only sufficient anti-

felicitating their people on *the progress their doctrines are making in the bosom of a Protestant Church!*" But it will not do. "Fallen and frenzied" as Rome is, the "Roman Priests" are not reduced so low as this. Nor will even they accept the fact, that "a family of the highest respectability" has gone over to them, "CHIEFLY by the reading of the Oxford publications," as endorsement good and sufficient of their Popery; any more than we should take the multitudes that come "like doves to their windows," to the shelter of the Church, from Presbyterian families of the highest respectability, to prove, that Mr. Boardman and his fellow Pastors are Churchmen in disguise, and doing all their diligence, in pulpit and in tract, to fill our swelling ranks.

A few words more, and this reluctant work is done. Of Mr. Boardman, whom we never saw, and for whom we entertain no feeling that is not altogether kind, we must repeat the expression of our disappointment. The hope was entertained—not that he would express his approbation of the Oxford writers, or agreement with them, but—that, on a re-consideration, he would candidly admit that he had been mistaken; that, whatever else they might be, they were

---

dote, respect for the true Church of the Fathers, as subsidiary to Scripture and a witness of its own true meaning. And the Rationalists on the contrary side, and the Liberals of the school of Locke and Hoadley, are never weary of claiming Hooker as the first distinct emanator of these principles. Whereas, even in respect of civil government, though he might allow their theory of its origin, he pointedly deprecates their theory of resistance. And, in respect of sacramental grace, and the consequent nature and importance of Church communion, themselves have never dared to claim sanction from him."—*Keble's Preface to Hooker's Works*, p. cv.

not Popish; and that therefore, to approve them, more or less, as many Churchmen do, was not to favour Popery. Such a discrimination, honourable to himself and just to all, would have met fully all the objects of the Call for Proof. The course which he has chosen will remind intelligent readers of his "Reply," of those judicious words of "the Judicious Hooker." "They which measure religion by dislike of the Church of Rome, think every man so much the more sound, by how much he can make the corruptions thereof to seem more large. Wisdom therefore and skill is requisite to know, what parts are sound in that Church, and what corrupted. Neither is it to all men apparent, which complain of unsound parts, with what kind of unsoundness every such part is possessed. They can say that in doctrine, in discipline, in prayers, in sacraments, the Church of Rome hath (as it hath indeed) very foul and gross corruptions; the nature whereof, notwithstanding, because they have not for the most part exact skill and knowledge to discern, they think that amiss many times which is not; and the salve of reformation they mightily call for, but where, and what the sores are which need it, as they wot full little, so they think it not greatly material to search."—*Ecclesiastical Polity*, IV. ch. viii. § 2. Our own day has seen quite too much of this. Who has not heard—and that by those with whom Mr. Boardman closely sympathises—the sweeping charge of Popery, brought, not only against the Church of which Hooker was a Presbyter, and its American sister, but against all and sin-

gular their doctrines, rules and usages?[1] Did they believe and teach the doctrine of the Apostolic succession? It was rank Popery. Popery was thus a matter of history. Did they maintain Baptismal regeneration? Still it was Popery. Then Popery was a doctrine. Did they administer Confirmation?[2] All Popery! Then Popery became a rite. Do they use a Liturgy? Popery! Popery is a form of prayer. Do they make the sign of the Cross in Baptism? Popery! Popery is a gesture. Do they kneel in the Communion? Popery! Popery is a posture. Do they wear a surplice? Popery! Popery is a garment. Do they erect a Cross upon a Church, or private dwelling? Sheer Popery! A bit of wood is Popery! Suppose the question should first be settled, What is Popery? In this settlement, the men of Oxford will be found most valuable helps.

But why should Mr. Boardman be so utterly proscriptive of the Church of Rome? Grant all her corruptions: yet she does hold some truths, and they cardinal; and common to her with the Church of England not only, and the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, but, thus far, with Mr.

---

[1] Mr. Boardman attempts to prove the Oxford writers Popish, from their disagreement with the standards of their own Church. He fails. But the attempt precludes a return to the old clamour, that the Church of England, and the Protestant Episcopal Church in America, are merely "Popery."

[2] When the Rector of a Parish, not far off, was preparing a class of candidates for confirmation, one of those preachers who rejoice in the name "other denominations," declared that it was all Popery; and that there was not one text for it in Scripture, except that where Paul "went through Syria and Cilicia, *confirming* the Churches."

Boardman, and his communion. Such are the doctrines of the Trinity, of the atonement, of sanctification by the Spirit, and of a final judgment, when the righteous and the wicked shall be separated forever. Grant that she has been, and is "a blasphemer, and a persecutor, and injurious:" yet there are enemies common to her, and those who hold with Mr. Boardman. Such are they whom St. Paul describes as "denying the Lord that bought them." Now, if Rome were overthrown, would these, and all who would make common cause with these, be satisfied? Would the warfare then be stayed? Would there be no farther call for Reformation?" Would Mr. Brownson, and such like, be quiet? "The argument," says Mr. Newman, (*Letter to Dr. Faussett*, p. 35,) "was evolved to its last link, at the time of the Reformation. The followers of Socinus then proclaimed that Rome was Babylon; and that those who so thought could not consistently stop till they thought Socinianism the Gospel." What else was indicated by those well known lines, so current then, by one of the extremest of the party,

> "Tota jacet Babylon, destruxit tecta Lutherus,
> Calvinus muros, *sed fundamenta Socinus?*"

Which may be rendered some how so—

> Whole Babylon is down, unroofed in Luther's reformation;
> The walls, John Calvin overthrew; Socinus, the foundation.

Of the good will to have it so, there can be little doubt. The sad history of the Reformation in Germany, Switzerland and Scotland, to come no nearer home, invests the homely distich with "something

of prophetic strain." Mr. Boardman, no doubt, would stop the work of demolition at the middle of the second line. But it is hard to jump but half way down a precipice. The beginning of an overthrow is easier than its termination. And why should any wish that Rome should be destroyed? Would not reform be better? Is even that impossible to faith and prayer? Nay, is not England, Rome reformed?

> "Who knows but gentle love
> May win her, at our patient care,
> The surer way to prove?"

For the Oxford writers, nothing need be asked, but that they be read. Just in proportion as this is done, the outcry is diminished. Not that all agree with them. Far from it! But that the charge of Popery or heresy is seen at once to be erroneous or malicious. Before they had been read at all, the Trojan horse was not regarded as a more pernicious portent. A portion of them were reprinted; and the well informed among their readers said, at once, This is not new! We knew all this before! These are the old Church principles, stated with fairness, and drawn out to just conclusions! And so far from being Popish, those who have but little sympathy on many points with Isaac Taylor, have felt what he has honestly declared—"the mode of repelling the pretensions of the Romish Church, recommended by the writers of the Oxford Tracts, seems to me to be at once legitimate and conclusive; it is in substance an appeal from the alleged authority of that Church to a Catholicity more Catholic, and to an antiquity

more ancient. On this ground, British Protestantism, or, let us say, if the phrase is preferred, British Christianity, stands on a rock, clear of all exception; and so far as relates to Popery, is exempt from all peril. Within the well defined limits which it observes, this line of argument is equally simple and irrefragable."[1] Give them, therefore, a candid hearing, and fair trial. Let it not be among the Christian freemen of America that they are treated, as the Chief Captain would have treated Paul, who "bade that he should be examined by scourging, that he might know wherefore they cried so against him." Of what they have not written, it becomes us to anticipate no judgment. But let those who wish to try their spirit, try it by their works.[2] A portion of the Tracts have been reprinted. These are accessible. The "Christian Year" comes in their name. That is established as a household book already. The two works of Mr. Newman, so often alluded to, his Lectures on Romanism and Popular Protestantism, and on Justification—the latter, a book which would engage and well reward the careful study of such minds, so trained, as Horace Binney's, John Sergeant's, George E. Badger's and David B. Ogden's—are necessary to a fair appreciation of their character and claims, and should in justice be republished. If to these, the five volumes of Mr. Newman's excellent Parochial Sermons, Mr. Keble's valuable sermon on Primitive Tradition, as recognized in Scripture, and the admirable little work by Arch-

[1] Dedication to "Ancient Christianity."

[2] The reader's attention is invited to an admirable Letter, in the Appendix, by the Rev. William Brudenell Barter, for which we are indebted to the Conservative Journal.

deacon Manning, on the Rule of Faith, were added, their most solicitous friends might safely trust their cause; and an addition would be made to the religious reading of the country, which would deserve and would receive the warmest gratitude. There is no risk in saying this, when it is known that their mere reprints of devotional works have brought on, already, a new era among publishers; not only procuring a market for such books as never sold before, but enlisting, in their execution, the best resources of the art, transcending even the English press itself.[1]

To those who shrink from controversial topics, and would shun all controversy, let it be said, in parting, it is not given to man. We hold the truth, only by dint of never-flinching firmness. The price of religious, not less than civil, freedom is perpetual vigilance. It is the injunction of a holy Apostle, "earnestly contend for the faith once delivered to the saints!" That priceless treasure has been perilled, through our carelessness and self-indulgence. The simple faith, which the first twelve proclaimed, and which was rescued at the Reformation, and restored, by hands, that clasped the burning stake, for love of it, to its primeval purity, has suffered compromise, through an undue respect for Martin Luther and John Calvin;[2] and been conceded, as the price of

[1] See the beautiful reprints of several of the best books, of the old devotion, by D. Appleton & Co., of New York.

[2] Excellent to the purpose are these words of the "Church of England Quarterly Review"—a journal never friendly to the Oxford writers. "Deluded by the phantom of Popery, which scares them away from consulting the primitive fathers as WITNESSES, they are content to grasp the shadow whilst losing the substance, and to take their articles of faith from John Calvin, instead of from those who knew and conversed with John the Divine."—No. xvii. p. 5.

peace, or through the flattery of smooth words, to the "mixed multitude" of their discordant followers. Those trumpet words of Paul to the Ephesians, "One Lord, One Faith, One Baptism," are shrunk from, as discourteous to the great Diana of our Ephesus, which rejoices in that descriptive title, "other denominations." "O that we knew," I quote the burning words of Mr. Newman, "O that we knew our own strength as a Church! O that instead of keeping on the defensive, and thinking it much not to lose our remnant of Christian light and holiness, which is getting less and less the less we use it; instead of being timid, and cowardly, and suspicious, and jealous, and panic-struck, and grudging, and unbelieving, we had a heart to rise, as a Church, in the attitude of the Spouse of Christ, and the Dispenser of His grace; to throw ourselves into that system of truth which our fathers have handed down, even through the worst of times, and to use it like a great and understanding people! O that we had the courage, and the generous faith, to aim at perfection, to demand the attention, to claim the submission of the world! Thousands of hungry souls, in all classes of life, stand around us: we do not give them what they want, the image of a true Christian people, living in that Apostolic awe and strictness, which carries with it an evidence that they are the Church of Christ! This is the way to withstand, and repel, the Romanists: not by cries of alarm, and rumours of plots, and dispute and denunciation, but by living up to the precepts and doctrines of the Gospel, as contained in the creeds, the services, the ordinances, the usages of our own

Church, without fear of consequences, without fear of being called Papists; to let matters take their course freely, and to trust to God's good providence for the issue."[1]

Let it not move us from this steadfast trust and hope—let it rather greatly encourage us!—that now, as of old, there is "no small stir about that way." It is a vain endeavour. The Ephesian cry, "Great is Diana!" will not now, as it did not then, arrest the progress of the truth. In vain, the makers of the "silver shrines" are called together. In vain, the motley host of sects make common cause. In vain, the wily Papist presses, with an oilier tongue, his specious claims. In vain, the appeal, "Sirs, ye know that by this craft we have our" influence! Men are determined to inquire. The title-deeds must be investigated. Truth will be traced to its first fountains. That which is new will be spurned off, as false. That which is old will be embraced, as *therefore* true. And, while the German and Genevan glosses are rejected, and "the novelties of Romanism," stripped of the "old garments" and the "clouted" "shoes," with which "they did work wilily, and went, and made as if they had been" ancients, are trampled under foot; THE CATHOLIC DOCTRINE,[2] which Paul preached, and which the Anglican Reformers, through blood and fire, restored, will be proclaimed again, and owned, "the truth as it is in Jesus," "the same yesterday, and to-day, and

[1] Letter to Dr. Faussett, pp. 102, 103.

[2] "Quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus."—*Vincent of Lerins.*

forever." Proclaimed, as at the first, and owned, in that one Church,[1] "the Church of God, which he hath purchased with his blood;" "built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone," which that "great Poet,[2] who is the glory and the blessing of our age,"[3] so well pourtrays:

"In my mind's eye, a Temple, like a cloud
Slowly surmounting some invidious hill,
Rose out of darkness: the bright work stood still,
And might of its own beauty have been proud;
But it was fashioned, and to God was vowed,
By virtues that diffused, in every part,
Spirit divine, though forms of human art;
Faith had her arch—her arch, when winds blew loud,
Into the consciousness of safety thrilled;
And Love her tower of dread foundation laid
Under the grave of things; Hope had her spire
Star-high, and pointed still to something higher:
Trembling, I gazed, but heard a voice. It said,
Hell-gates are powerless phantoms, when WE build."

---

[1] "There is *one body*, and one Spirit."—*St. Paul to the Ephesians.*

[2] Wordsworth. [3] Hugh James Rose.

"Whether therefore we have to defend our Church against the Romanist, the Puritan, or the Rationalist; and the day is come when we have not to defend her against one or another, but against them all; and therefore when it behooves us to adopt a principle of defence which will avail us against them all, and to say, with the warrior of old, when tempted to look to one point of the ramparts too exclusively,

ἢ καὶ ἐμοὶ ΤΑΔΕ ΠΑΝΤΑ μέλει:

we shall find a magazine of arms fitted for our purpose in the writings of the Primitive Fathers; so that a man well versed in these—it being presumed of course that he is familiar with the Scriptures—can seldom be taken at disadvantage by either of these various assailants; while it seems scarcely possible for one ignorant of them, to conduct his argument with such discretion, as not to lay himself open to thrusts, which come from quarters so different."—*Professor Blunt's Introductory Lecture, at Cambridge.*

APPENDIX.

"We undertake to show that the most glorious Gospel of God, and the ancient Bishops, and the Primitive Church, are on our side; and that we have not withdrawn from the Church of Rome, and returned to the Apostles and old Catholic Fathers, without a just cause; and this we shall do, not obscurely, nor disingenuously, but in good faith, as in the presence of God, truly, clearly, perspicuously."—Bishop Jewell, *Apology*.

"What have our pious governors done, then, in religion? Had we gone about to lay a new foundation, the work had been accursed; now we have only scraped off some superfluous moss, that was grown upon these holy stones; we have cemented some broken pieces; we have pointed some crazy corners with wholesome mortar, instead of base clay, with which it was disgracefully patched up. The altar is old; it is God's altar: it is not new, not ours. If we have laid one new stone in this sacred building, let it fly in our faces, and beat out our eyes!"—Bishop Hall, *Contemplations*.

APPENDIX.

I. MR. PERCEVAL'S LETTER.

To the Editor of the Irish Ecclesiastical Journal.

Sir,—The sight of Mr. Sewell's letter in the Ecclesiastical Journal of November last, has induced me, with the hope of furthering the good work of reconciliation, to request permission to offer a word of explanation on a point connected with the Theological or Ecclesiastical movement of which Oxford has been the centre, which has given rise to much misunderstanding. I allude to the notion which has gone abroad, of there being, or having been, some secret association, combination, or conspiracy, among the original promoters of that movement, to alter the doctrine or discipline of the Church of England, from that which is exhibited in her authorized formularies. I believe the notion took its rise chiefly from an expression in one of the Letters in "Froude's Remains," vol. i. p. 377, where, writing to one of his friends, he observes, "Do you know, I partly fear that you, and ——, and ——, are going to back out of the conspiracy, and leave me and —— to our fate;" at least, I find this passage referred to by the Margaret Professor, as the ground of imputing to the parties in question the design above named. As I am myself the individual last referred to by Mr. Froude, as likely, in his opinion, to continue steadfast with him in "the conspiracy," even if deserted by others; I may perhaps be allowed as a competent witness to speak of the origin, nature and extent of the same. This therefore, I proceed to state, and if there is any body of men likely to receive that statement favourably, I venture to think it is the body of the Irish clergy, when they shall be informed that that combination and conspiracy had its rise in sympathy for their deep affliction, when in 1833, their loyal obedience to the British Crown, their faithful testimony to the truth, and their patient endurance of murderous persecution, were requited by the ministers of the day with that wanton act of sacrilege, which produced an outcry of shame from some, even of their bitterest enemies; I mean the destruction of the ten bishoprics.

This monstrous act had the effect of awakening some who till then had slumbered in the secure and easy confidence that the Church had nothing to fear from the State, into whatever hands the management of the latter might fall; and it set those whose attention had long been painfully alive to the difficulties and dangers of the time, upon considering whether some combined effort might not or could not be made, with the hope, if possible, even at that late hour, to arrest that fatal measure, or at any rate, to offer resistance to further outrage upon the Church on either side of the channel; and, whether the resistance might or might not be successful in arresting the evil, yet at all events, to leave on record a witness of the evil, and a protest against it. With this view, three of the parties alluded to in the passage of Froude's letter, given above, (Mr. Froude, another, and myself,) met at the house of a common friend,[1] now no more, in July of that year, to talk over matters, and consider what could be done. And it being very clear, that the support which such a measure as the Irish Council Bill had received in both Houses of Parliament, was to be attributed to ignorance of the constitution, and nature of the Church; ignorance of its existence as a society distinct from the State, and ignorance of the Divine commission and authority of government which its chief pastors had received, we came to the conclusion, that the first and most necessary step to be taken for the defence and preservation of the Church was, to revive in men's minds, a practical recognition of the truth set forth in the preface to the ordination service. On the breaking up of our meeting, Mr. Froude and —— returned to Oxford, from whence, after they had consulted with the two others alluded to in the extract cited above, I heard from them both, to the effect, that it was agreed we should at once make a united effort, both by ourselves and as many as we could by private or public appeal induce to exert themselves, in behalf of these *two points:* namely, first, the firm and practical maintenance of the doctrine of the Apostolic Succession, so grievously outraged by the Irish Church Act. Secondly, the preservation in its integrity of the Christian doctrine in our Prayer-books, with a view to avert the Socinian leaven with which we had reason to fear it would be tainted, by the parliamentary alteration of it, which at that

[1] The Rev. Hugh James Rose, then Rector of Hadleigh, in Suffolk.

time was openly talked of. These formed the whole and sole basis of the agreement for united exertions then entered into by the five individuals of whom Mr. Froude speaks. Nor was any extension of the objects either agreed to, or proposed, at any subsequent period.

Appeal was forthwith extensively made to the members of the Church for their support of these two objects. And one of the first results of "the conspiracy" was, the clerical address to the Archbishop of Canterbury, signed by (I think) about 7,000 of the clergy; and another was the lay declaration of attachment to the Church, signed by not less than 800,000 heads of families. From which two events we may date the commencement of the turn of the tide, which had threatened to overthrow our Church and our religion.

Now, that it may not be supposed that this explanation is an afterthought, or that I have in any way misrepresented the state of the case, I subjoin an extract from the letter which I received from Mr. Froude, after his return to Oxford, from the meeting of which I have spoken, and also the statements of two others of "the conspirators" on the same subject. It is dated Oriel College, Aug. 14, 1833.

My Dear ——, The impression left on my mind by my visit to Rose was, on the whole, a gloomy one; i. e., that in the present state of the country we have very poor materials to work upon; and that the only thing to be done is, to direct all our efforts towards the dissemination of better principles.

"Since I have been back at Oxford, Keble has been here, and he, ——, and Newman, have come to an agreement, that the points which ought to be put forward by us are the following:

"I. The doctrine of apostolic succession, as a rule of practice; i. e.

"(1.) That the participation of the body and blood of Christ is essential to the maintenance of Christian life and hope in each individual;

"(2.) That it is conveyed to individual Christians *only* by the hands of the successors of the Apostles and their delegates;

"(3.) That the successors of the Apostles are those who are descended in a direct line from them by the imposition of hands; and that the delegates of these are the respective presbyters whom each has commissioned;

"II. That it is sinful voluntarily to allow the interference of persons or bodies, not members of the Church, in matters spiritual;

"III. That it is desirable to make the Church more popular, as far as is consistent with the maintenance of its apostolic character.

"Newman and —— *add*, but Keble *demurs*.

"IV. We protest against all efforts directed to the subversion of existing institutions, or to the separation of Church and State;

"V. We think it a duty steadily to contemplate and provide for the contingency of such a separation.

"Keble demurs to these, because he thinks the union of Church and State, as it is now understood, actually sinful. In the next we all agree.

"VI. We hold it to be the duty of every clergyman to stir up his brother clergy to the consideration of these and similar subjects, and if possible to induce them to do the same."

Having expressed to my friends, my concurrence in the objection, under the existing aspect of the times, to any such pledge as that implied in the fourth section, considering, that unless the course then pursued and threatened by the State were altered, we had no alternative between separation and apostacy; I received from one of them the following statement, dated Oxford, August 23, 1833.

"With respect to your observations, it seems to me that Froude has made a mistake in sending you some articles which, on further discussion, we thought it better not to introduce. The two principles of the society would be—a firm maintenance of the apostolical succession, and a resolution to preserve the integrity of Christian doctrine in our Prayer-book, that is, not to allow it to be watered down to Socinianism.

"Such would simply be the principles of the society."

From another of them (Mr. Newman) I received the following matured account, (drawn up by Mr. Keble,) dated, Oxford, Sept. 6, 1833.

"Considering, 1. That the only way of salvation is the partaking of the body and blood of our sacrificed Redeemer;

"2. That the mean expressly authorized by Him for that purpose is the holy sacrament of His supper;

"3. That the security, by Him no less expressly authorized, for the continuance and due application of that sacrament, is the apostolical commission of the bishops, and under them the presbyters of the Church;

"4. That under the present circumstances of the Church in England, there is peculiar danger of these matters being slighted

and practically disavowed, and of numbers of Christians being left or tempted to precarious and unauthorized ways of communion, which must terminate often in virtual apostacy:

"We desire to pledge ourselves one to another, reserving our canonical obedience, as follows:

"1. To be on the watch for all opportunities of inculcating on all committed to our charge, a due sense of the inestimable privilege of communion with our Lord through the successors of the apostles; and of leading them to the resolution to transmit it, by His blessing, unimpaired to their children;

"2. To provide and circulate books and tracts which may tend to familiarize the imaginations of men to the idea of an apostolical commission, to represent to them the feelings and principles resulting from that doctrine in the purest and earliest Churches, and especially to point out its fruits as exemplified in the practice of the primitive Christians; their communion with each other, however widely separated, and their resolute sufferings for the truth's sake;

"3. To do what lies in us towards reviving among Churchmen the practice of daily common prayer, and more frequent participation of the Lord's Supper. And whereas there seems great danger at present of attempts at unauthorized and inconsiderate innovation, as in other matters so especially in the service of our Church, we pledge ourselves;

"4. To resist any attempt that may be made to alter the liturgy on insufficient authority; i. e., without the exercise of the free and deliberate judgment of the Church on the alterations proposed;

"5. It will also be one of our objects to place within the reach of all men sound and true accounts of those points in our discipline and worship, which may appear from time to time most likely to be misunderstood or undervalued, and to suggest such measures as may promise to be most successful in preserving them."

And thus, Sir, without the slightest reserve, have I given to the inspection of my Irish brethren all the communications which I received on the principles to be aimed at by the united effort, which, at that season of peril and alarm, it was agreed to make, in defence of our Master's house, and of the principles of truth and order on which it is founded; and when the whole affair is calmly weighed, it will amount to no more than this, namely, a stirring up of ourselves and others to an active and faithful discharge of duties, which, by our

very calling as members, and by our office as ministers of the Church, were already binding upon us. It is but right to add, that Dr. Pusey, who has been held in general estimation as responsible for the whole affair, had nothing to do with the first promotion of the undertaking.

With respect to the exceptions taken against many of the publications which from various quarters were circulated, with the design of aiding the attempt above named; let any man consider how extremely difficult, if not impossible, it would be for the most practised hands, in the calmest times, and with the utmost deliberation, to produce a series of papers free from real or supposed grounds of censure; and then he will cease to wonder that publications put forth in times of the greatest excitement, by hands for the most part unpractised, and under the influence of the strongest apprehension of real danger, should contain many things, which either as to matter, or manner, or both, might have been better otherwise. When I offered objections to some of the things which appeared, I received the following answer, which, under the emergency of the case, satisfied me, and will, I think, satisfy any dispassionate person who considers the subject in relation to that emergency. It is dated Oxford, July 20, 1834.

"As to the tracts, every one has his own taste. You object to some things, another to others. If we altered to please every one, the effect would be spoiled. They were not intended as symbols *è cathedrâ*, but as the expressions of *individual* minds, and individuals, feeling strongly, while, on the one hand, they are incidentally faulty in mode or language, are still peculiarly effective. No great work was done by a system; whereas systems rise out of individual exertions. Luther was an individual. The very faults of an individual excite attention; he loses, but his cause (if good, and he powerful-minded) gains; this is the way of things, we promote truth by a self-sacrifice. There are many things in ——'s tract —— which I could have wished said otherwise, for one reason or other; but the whole was to my mind admirable, most persuasive, and striking."

In short, if those publications served the purpose of a rallying cry to the friends of the Church; if they have availed, directly or indirectly, to satisfy men, that the Church in these kingdoms is not a creature of the state, professing merely a negation of certain errors, to be changed or modified to suit the spirit of the age; but that it is a divinely constituted society, with a divinely commissioned govern-

ment, having fixed and heaven-descended principles, which being founded on immutable truth, can endure neither mutilation nor compromise, but must be defended and abided by in time, by those who would secure in CHRIST the reward of eternity; and in defence of which, if need be, all suffering must be undergone: if I say, those publications have at all prevailed, and in proportion as they have availed, under GOD, to impress this view of sacred things on men's minds, and so to secure to those who come after us, unimpaired, those blessings which have been transmitted to us, they have answered the object of those who promoted the undertaking; who will count so great a blessing cheaply purchased at the cost of the temporary misrepresentation, obloquy, and reproach, which it has been their lot to bear in the prosecution of this good design.

In conclusion, I should request permission to offer one word in respect of a publication, "Froude's Remains," which, more than any other, appears to have been the occasion of the alarm and misrepresentation which has spread respecting the designs of the promoters of the movement which had its rise at Oxford; and without expressing an opinion, as I am not called upon to do, either as to the prudence or otherwise of the publication, or as to the soundness or unsoundness of many of the views expressed in it, I would request all, whether they approve or disapprove of the publishing it, whether they admire or condemn the theological opinions contained in it, to bear this in mind; namely, that those volumes contain the expression of the workings of a young and ardent mind, seeking after truth with a singleness of purpose, and a noble disregard of all sublunary and temporary consequences, rarely to be met with; doing that which most men are blamed for not doing, that is to say, refusing to take things for granted to be true, because they were told him, but striving to weigh all things in the balances of the sanctuary, and prepared to embrace truth wherever he should find it, at any and whatever cost.

That fervent zeal and high-minded enthusiasm which shone from his eagle eye, and formed the charm of his conversation, and has left so deep an impression of affection to his memory in the minds of all who had the privilege of his friendship, while they prompted him to a noble course of great exertion, at the same time led him frequently to express himself, as is apparent from his letters, hastily, upon imperfect information, and without due consideration of all the bearings

of the point before him. But he was open to conviction, and ever ready to embrace that modification or alteration of any view he might previously have entertained, which, after due examination, he was persuaded approached nearer to the truth.—This is plain from the letters published in his "Remains," which show what great modifications of the view in which at first he had regarded the Church of Rome, he had been led, upon more accurate information, to adopt.—And this process was going on until it pleased God to take him in the midst of his labors; for in the very last letter which it was my privilege to receive from him, dated Barbadoes, September 9, 1834, after having set forth in his earnest, zealous way his view of certain points of theology, in which he thought I needed correction, he concluded with these words: "And now I have done with my criticisms; if you think them very wild, and have time to tell me so, it will be a great satisfaction to me, for I feel as if thinking by myself had set my wits rambling." In that same letter he expressed his opinion on the relative position of the Church of England, in respect to Rome and other religious communities; which seems to me worthy of record.

"If I was to assign my reason for belonging to the Church of England, in preference to any other religious community, it would be simply this, that she has retained an apostolical clergy, and enacts no sinful terms of communion; whereas on the one hand, the Romanists, though retaining an apostolical clergy, do exact sinful terms of communion; and on the other, no other religious community has retained such a clergy."

Moreover, let my deceased friend be tried by the publications for which alone he is responsible, I mean those which he had himself prepared and committed to the press, and from which his deliberate convictions are to be ascertained; and though many may find reason to differ in opinion with him, they will, I think, find nothing to reprove. If his friends had confined themselves to the two last volumes they would, according to my judgment, have done better justice to his memory, and better served the cause, in the defence of which his life was consumed. But they acted, I doubt not, under the conviction expressed by one of them, in the extract I have given above; namely, that "individuals feeling strongly, while on the one hand they are incidentally faulty in mode and language, are still peculiarly effective," that "the very faults of an individual excite attention, he loses, but his cause (if good and he powerful-minded) gains; this is

the way of things, we promote truth by a self-sacrifice;" and believing that both the matter and manner exhibited in the frank and unreserved communications of their deceased friend, were calculated to startle men from the apparent lethargy as to ecclesiastical principles, which seemed at that time so extensive, and to lead them to inquire and examine on points which, though, according to our view, essential and fundamental in the Christian system, seemed likely to be passed by and set aside as things unworthy of notice, they were willing for the sake of obtaining this inquiry and examination, which is all they asked, to hazard not only the censure and suspicion, which would inevitably fall to their share, but what was of far higher value in their sight, the temporary misunderstanding of their deceased friend's character, and the posthumous reproach which (they could not but have foreseen) would be the (almost necessary) consequence of the course which they adopted; being sure that when they should meet him hereafter in the land of spirits, he who while living was willing to sacrifice all for the sake of truth, would frankly forgive them for having hazarded for a time his reputation among mortals, if by so doing, they had hoped the better to promote those interests which are immortal.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

ARTHUR P. PERCEVAL,

Formerly of Oriel, now of All Souls' College, Oxford.

P. S.—To prevent misunderstanding, I think it right to add, with respect to the "Tracts for the Times," that I am myself answerable for three of the early Numbers, 23, 35, and 36, and for these only. My opinion as to some of the later ones, will be found in the British Magazine for May, 1839.

II. MR. BARTER'S LETTER.

To the Editor of the Conservative Journal.

SIR,—Believing that the authors of the Tracts for the Times, are the authors also of an increasing reverence among us for our Church, as a divine institution, and, believing that in times of danger they have made known to us the real strength of her position, and the only legitimate means by which she may be defended, I am not surprised that unlearned and unstable men should have attacked them in the

worst spirit of religious controversy. Such opponents, however, might safely be disregarded, and permitted, without a comment, to persevere in their violent and contradictory accusations. But, it seems to me, that any among us who feel gratitude to these men for their exertions in our sacred cause, do well to state their reasons for this feeling with firmness and moderation, when the same charges are advanced by men of piety and acknowledged talent. I have read with much pleasure your remarks on Lord Morpeth's speech; what you have said on the hostility manifested by some members of our Church to the Book of Common Prayer, touches a chord to which my feelings so completely respond, that I cannot but hope that you will not decline giving, to the few remarks which I shall make, the benefit of your extensive circulation. With regard to the attack which his lordship has thought fit to make on the University of Oxford, if he considers the matter impartially, he must be convinced that the University of Oxford is not more answerable for the publication of the Tracts for the Times, than for the publication of the able speeches which he delivers in the House of Commons. It would be a hard measure to call that venerable seat of learning to account for every production of those who have had the benefit of its instructions. As to the tendency of the doctrines advanced in the Tracts for the Times to Popery, his lordship would see immediately if he gave any attention to the matter, that men who professed precisely the same principles in their day, are among the most able defenders of our Church, against the errors and encroachments of that superstition, and that the names of many such may be found in the list of those who, in the time of James the Second, perilled their liberties and lives, by putting themselves in the first rank of its opponents. But I am not surprised that Lord Morpeth has fallen into this mistake. The same error has been committed by many men of high talent and station in our Church, who have also gone further than he, and have ventured to enter into controversy with these men, without fully comprehending the nature of the principles which they have attempted to beat down. The most popular charges which are brought of late against writers of the Tracts for the Times are these: A desire to set up a new system of doctrine in our Church, and to put aside the principles of the Protestant Reformation. I will say as few words as possible on each of these subjects.

The first of these charges, is an attempt to set up a new system

of Christian doctrine in this country, as if the men who write in these publications were now, for the first time, disclosing a system hitherto wholly unheard of, and, in fact, the offspring of their own imaginations. Now, the truth is, they have never endeavoured to recommend a single opinion or doctrine of their own, they have attempted to turn the attention of their brethren solely to the pure creed of the primitive Church of Christ. To their innocence in this respect, their enemies themselves bear witness; the most able of whom [1] has allowed (as every one must, who does not shut his eyes to the truth,) that the doctrines they advocate, are the doctrines of primitive Christianity. So much for the novelty of their creed.

Then as to their setting aside the principles of the Protestant Reformation, or disarming them, as it has been said, of their poignancy and efficacy, on account of which, every sincere friend of that reformation has been called upon openly to declare his dissent from these doctrines. The following I consider a satisfactory answer. The principle of the Protestant reformation is a wide term, almost as wide as that of the Protestant religion, it may mean any thing or nothing; but the true, the avowed principle of the Protestant reformation in the English Church, was nothing else but to restore the doctrine of the primitive Church of Christ, purified from Romish corruptions; this was the only principle of reformation professed by Cranmer, Latimer, and Ridley, and this principle is the all-pervading one of the Tracts for the Times, so that were the real friends of the Protestant reformation to declare their dissent from these doctrines, they would make a desperate and very unwise attack upon themselves and their own tenets. But, it may be asked, if the writers of the Tracts for the Times are pure in doctrine, and blameless and harmless, why is so loud a voice raised against them? Why are grave men in authority, periodicals of conflicting religious opinions, newspapers without number, unwearied in their attacks? Some with more polished weapons, others *stipitibus sudibusque præustis*, of vulgar and coarse abuse? A plain answer is this, because these men have put themselves forward as defenders of the fortress of the Church of England—the Book of Common Prayer. It is for this book, and not for these men that I fear.

[1] Mr. Isaac Taylor.

To suffer under false accusations is a severe trial, but they may support it with Christian patience, and great will be their reward in heaven. But this I know, that if they are beaten down, their adversaries will have gained no victory, while the Book of Common Prayer remains unmutilated. In that book, the principles of the primitive Church must circulate widely through the land. The congregations of the Church of England must still address their God in the words, and in the spirit, of the primitive Church of Christ. In those prayers, in the forms of baptism, of burial, and the rite of confirmation, of ordaining deacons and priests, they must find the main doctrines of the Tracts for the Times, set forth in as plain terms as the wisdom of man could devise; and in the catechism, in which (if they act honestly) they are bound to instruct their children, they will find not a word to favour the modern gloss on the doctrine of justification by faith, but the whole in perfect harmony with that doctrine as held by the primitive Church of Christ. Would that all who loved this sacred deposit read the history of former times, and judged, by the perils it has escaped, of its present danger. When Laud was beheaded, there would have been no triumph of the independent principle had not, on the same day, the use of the Book of Common Prayer ceased throughout the land. Then, indeed, it gained a short-lived victory. Let us consider for a moment the state of the Church of England when these Tracts were first published. Independent principles had for a long time silently gained ground within its pale. The liturgy, and especially the Church services, were in many instances mutilated according to the caprice of those who, though independent in principle, had become inconsistent ministers of the Church of England. The catechism was frequently discarded from schools superintended by the Clergy of our Church, as unfit for the instruction of children in the doctrines of Christianity. Curtailments in the morning and evening service of our Church, and alterations in our creeds, were spoken of with as much freedom as men would discuss alterations in the shape of a garment, in order to meet the varying fashion of the present hour. Publications, in which the tenets of Calvin and John Knox could only be sincerely maintained (for the authors professed their creed, and were not of our communion,) had crept into the families of many pious Church-

men, and, if they had done nothing worse, had lessened their reverence for the real and characteristic doctrines of the Church of England. Tracts were circulated by thousands to propagate a modern system of Christianity, from which all mention of the sacrament of baptism was excluded, as a subject, not of sufficient importance to demand attention; and although such things were done avowedly under the sanction, and by the aid, of ministers of our Church, no authoritative voice was lifted up to check the evil.

In the meantime, Popery was numbering her converts by thousands in our land: and, notwithstanding the examples of America and Scotland, in which the increase was proportionably greater; it was attributed to the want of lively reformation principles, with the same truth as some mediciners of the present day attribute the bad health of their patients to not imbibing a sufficient quantity of their noxious specifics. Nor was this all the danger; the Clergy of the Church of England were unarmed, the dissenters claimed the victory, when opposed on principles falsely termed Evangelical; and claimed it with justice, and the right cause was on the point of being overborne by the number and violence of its assailants. The Book of Common Prayer stood alone in the midst of the troubled waters. It stood a beautiful fortress of the olden time, but as it was constructed, as if in perfect contempt of the rules of modern art, its mutilation or destruction was contemplated as an easy task, to be completed at leisure, whenever its enemies might agree on the style of building they would wish to raise in its stead. It was at this juncture that God raised up pious and learned men in its defence, and the firmness of the rock on which they built their outwork may be known by the foam of the waters which have dashed against it, and the violence of their recoil. So far, then, from exhorting my younger brethren of the Clergy not to meet these men fairly in argument, advice which has emanated indeed from a very high and liberal quarter, so far from advising them a dogged adherence to their own opinions, I would call on them to inquire diligently whether these men are employed in vindicating the doctrines of Scripture and of primitive Christianity, and if they find it to be so, I would advise them to defend—not these men, who are subject to error, but—the faith they profess, which was delivered to the saints, and is treasured in the Holy

Catholic Church. Above all, I would exhort them not to meddle with those who are given to change. If one of Raphael's tablets were in your possession (I would ask them) how would you act? Would you venture to retouch or to repaint it? Would it not rather be your care, if it were possible, to cleanse it from all stains, to bring out the beauties that had been obscured by the effect of time, and to restore every tint of the glorious original? And will you treat the sacred deposit of Catholic truth committed to your charge with less reverence? God forbid! Oh, guard it from those who would not hesitate to daub the sacred relic with the coarse colouring of modern art. Suffer not Geneva cloaks to be substituted for its graceful and flowing drapery. Take your side with the Church of the martyrs; and if their memory is assailed with the grossest ribaldry, who cannot be disturbed in their place of rest, is it not plain that the same spirit is at work which opposed that holy army 1,700 years ago; and that it should be met on our part as it was on theirs, with the same entire devotion to the cause of primitive Christianity.

William Brudenell Barter,
Rector of Highclere and Burghclere, Hants.

P.S.—I write against the spirit in which the Tracts for the Times are opposed. I do not agree with all the opinions advanced in those writings, especially on the subject of sin after baptism, and reserve in communicating religious knowledge. Divines, however, who prefer the authority of the pious and eloquent Mr. Cecil to that of the Fathers of our Church, the friends and companions of the Apostles, should recollect that he acted precisely on this principle of reserve when he first entered on his ministry in St. John's chapel. Dr. Platt, his biographer, when he mentions this fact says, that the religious part of his auditory, "not comprehending his aim, were ready to pronounce on his plan, as shunning to declare the whole counsel of God; yet he was wisely following the example of his Master in delivering the truth as they who heard were able to bear it, and thus forming a lodgment in their minds, and preparing them for a full display of all the doctrines of the Gospel." Those, therefore, who profess to hold Mr. Cecil in high esteem, might, on this point, consistently abstain from any *very violent* denunciation of the Tracts for the Times.

Postscript.

During the progress of these pages through the press, events, in England, have transpired, in rapid succession, which seem, to some, to affect its subject-matter very seriously. The publication of the ninetieth Tract for the Times; the letter of enquiry as to the author's name, addressed to the Editor by not less than four Tutors; the censure of the Hebdomadal Board; Mr. Newman's avowal of the authorship; the request of the Bishop of Oxford, that the Tracts might be discontinued; and the Editor's prompt expression of compliance—scarcely a month has sufficed to bring these tidings to our ears: and to produce the impression, in the minds of the truculent, on the one hand, and of the timid, on the other, of some great, overwhelming crisis, as if the Reformation were about to retrograde! From one quarter, our ears are pained by the savage whoop, or—far more odious!—the sanctimonious whine, of anticipated exultation; as if, at last, it were made certain, that Christian brethren, and stewards of God's mysteries, *must* combine the foulest treachery with an apostacy the most abandoned, and go over to the Pope! From another, we are scarcely less distressed by the unworthy fears, and premature misgivings, and equivocating censures, of those whose indolence has kept them ignorant, and whose timidity distrusts the truth.[1] The

[1] These remarks apply to none, but those whose position or pretensions make them justly responsible, at least, for the withholding of their judgment, until

present writer looks with shame and sorrow on this state of things. He wonders, that with men, who claim to be intelligent, and think that they are independent, such a state of things should have been possible. He has no interest in the subject which every Christian freeman should not have, in all that can concern the truth, that makes, and keeps us, free. He has no information on the subject, which is not equally accessible to every man in the community. He has not, and he never had, a word of correspondence with any one connected, even most remotely, with what is called "the Oxford movement." All his English correspondents, like himself, receive the Oxford writings, and judge of them by a standard held and owned long before Oxford Tracts were dreamed of; ADOPTING THEM, SO FAR AS THEY AGREE with "Holy Scripture and ancient authors"[1] —or, as may be stated, more familiarly, and, yet, the same in practice, WITH THE BIBLE AND THE PRAYER BOOK—and rejecting them, if they should not. From not one of these, has one word reached him, as to the late conjuncture of events; and, by a most provoking perverseness, his arrangements, through his Bookseller, for the receipt of all new publications important for their ecclesiastical interest, have at this moment altogether failed him: so that he has not yet seen the ninetieth Tract, nor any one of the host of pam-

---

they have informed themselves correctly upon the subject. To the multitude of honest Christians who love peace, and who are naturally anxious at the appearance of division or disquiet, it may suffice to say, there is no ground for anxiety! It is but the ejection from the Church of the malign influences of cant and Calvinism, that now disturbs it; crying with a loud voice, as of old, when they come forth. "Stand still, and see the salvation of the Lord!"

[1] Preface to the Ordinal, in the Book of Common Prayer.

phlets[1] which it has produced, except the Letter of the Rev. Dr. Hook, to the Bishop of Ripon, on the State of Parties in England;[2] and that in an English newspaper. And yet, his confidence in the doctrinal integrity of the Oxford writers continues unshaken: and, as the report, that might be wafted to him in the midst of Indian or Arabian

---

[1] This term seems not too strong. The following titles of pamphlets, just announced, occur at a moment's thought.

Revival of old Church principles, by Laicus.

Mr. Newman's Letter to the Lord Bishop of Oxford, on occasion of Tract No. 90, in the series called "The Tracts for the Times."

Mr. Newman's letter to Dr. Jelf, in explanation of the Tract No. 90.

Professor Sewell's Letter to Dr. Pusey, on the publication of the Tract No. 90.

A few words in support of No. 90, of "The Tracts for the Times," by the Rev. W. G. Ward.

Lord Morpeth's remarks on the authors of "The Tracts for the Times" considered, by the Rev. W. B. Barter.

Mr. Perceval's Vindication of the principles of the Authors of "the Tracts for the Times."

Dr. Hook's Letter to the Bishop of Ripon, on the state of parties in the Church of England.

Mr. Palmer's Letter to Dr. Wiseman, containing remarks on his Letter to Mr. Newman.

[2] Not as authority—for the present writer repudiates the judgment of the Oxford writers, for or against, on any other ground than their own writings—but as information, as all the information he posseses, beyond what he has seen in our own Journals, a few sentences are here added from Dr. Hook's Letter to the Bishop of Ripon. After speaking of the act of "the Hebdomadal Board," as a "most unhappy determination" "to censure Mr. Newman—a censure which I have little doubt the Convocation of the University would, if summoned, reverse:" he says, "on the publication of the 90th Tract for the Times, I deter-

deserts, that any three of his beloved and respected brethren in the Presbyterate (*pace illorum dixerit*) had fallen down into Mormonism, would pass him, as the idle wind; so he repudiates, as morally impossible, the thought, that Mr. Newman, Dr. Pusey and Professor Keble—the holy three, for whom especially the furnace now

---

mined to point out, in a pamphlet, what I consider to be its errors. But the moment I heard that the writer was to be *silenced, not by arguments, but by a usurped authority*, that moment I determined to renounce my intention, that moment I determined to take my stand with him; because, I did not altogether approve of a particular Tract, yet, in general principles, in the very principles advocated in that tract, I did agree with him." "And, in justice to one, whom I am proud to call my friend, I am bound to say that Mr. Newman's explanatory letter to Dr. Jelf is, to my mind, perfectly satisfactory."

The spirit of these sentences will tell upon the American heart. The only sovereign power on earth to which man's heart may bow, is TRUTH: and only that, because it is THE VOICE OF GOD. Galileo was imprisoned. Still, the earth revolved—"e pur, si muove!" "The Hebdomadal Board" have censured Mr. Newman. So did the Papal Bulls proscribe free-speaking Luther. In either case, is error proved? Can *force* make truth of error; or of error, truth? Not while the mind is immaterial and immortal! Not while God reigns!

It is perhaps not worth while to say it: but the report of ill-feeling between Dr. Hook and his diocesan, like ninety-nine in every hundred of the rumours of the day, is perfectly untrue. He was called to order by the Bishop, in the Chair, at a meeting of the Christian Knowledge Society, in his Parish; and instantly and cheerfully complied with the decision. But the whole meeting was a perfect triumph for Dr. Hook; and in that triumph no one more heartily rejoiced than the Bishop of Ripon himself. Of all which, any one may be assured who will refer to the paper called the "John Bull," dated April 10. The Letter, from which the foregoing extracts are made, addressed to the Bishop of Ripon, contains the substance of what Dr. Hook would have said, at the meeting, had his speech been continued.

is heated "one seven times more than it was wont"—have all, or any of them apostatized, or ever can apostatize, to Popery.

Let him use the freedom of a brother, to address a few words of affectionate expostulation to brethren in Christ Jesus. Have not the Oxford writers, all and singular, the liberty with which Christ has made us free, to think, and speak, and write, as conscience dictates, and their sense of duty urges them, of the high matters of his Gospel and his Church? Nay, are they not, as Christian teachers, bound to "stir up the gift" that is in them; and, "speaking the truth in love," to utter "things wherewith one may edify another"? Are not their writings to be tried, in common with the writings of all their brethren, by Holy Scripture, as interpreted in the received formularies of their own communion? Is not the rule, in their case, the same as from the beginning it has been, "To THE LAW AND TO THE TESTIMONY: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them"? Are they not amenable, and are they not constant and cheerful, in avowing, and in proving, themselves amenable, to their ecclesiastical superiors? If they are erroneous, if they are heretical, if they are Popish, is there any thing easier than, by this test, and under these auspices, to prove them such? Does it accord with the high, manly spirit of the Christian freemen of England or of America, to rejoice that a discussion, which, through the course of eight long years,[2] has not been silenced by argument, is now suspended by authority? Was there no logic to prevail against the Oxford writers but the law? Must all the Protestantism, and all the piety, confess itself unequal to the conflict, without the aid of "the Hebdomadal Board"? And is it true, as we are gravely told, that the "subjects" of the Oxford writings—

[2] The Oxford Tracts began to be published in 1833.

charged, as they are, with Popery—are "poorly understood, and considered, among *us*?"[1] Must we import our judgments? Is it not strange, if all that is alleged were so, that public sentiment could not put down the Oxford Tracts; which yet, at the simple intimation of a Christian Bishop, sink, in a moment, into silence? Will any one believe that the Protestant government, which supports the Popish College of Maynooth, would quarrel with Oxford, for a little Popery? Will any one, that reads the article on "Romish Priests in Ireland," in the last Quarterly Review, (No. cxxxiv,) suppose that Mr. Newman would lose favour with Lord Morpeth, for leaning towards Rome? "Credat Judæus Appella!" In the vernacular, "Tell that to the marines!"

Christian freemen of America, act on your own responsibility to God, your Judge. Believe not treacherous apostacy of any brother, but on evidence that cannot be resisted. Read, think, judge for yourselves. "Prove all things, hold fast that which is good." The Oxford writings, and their authors, however intrinsically unimportant, have been made—not by themselves, or by their friends, but by the ignorance or malice of their enemies—the crowning subject of the times. There is no community, in which twelve men could now be empannelled, for their trial, that have not formed and expressed an opinion for or against them. Nay, the exacting arrogance of some would have it written upon each man's forehead—nay, more than that, would peer, with knives and pincers, into each man's heart, that they might know—his judgment of the Oxford Tracts! Assert your privilege, as freemen, then, to say—you will

[1] See Hooker and Agnew's proposal to reprint—"if sufficiently encouraged" —twenty shillings' worth of condemnation of the Oxford Tracts.

allow of no such, worse than Papal, inquisition! Act on the simple, obvious duty, to believe men innocent, until their guilt is proved! "Doth our law judge any man, before it hear him, and know what he doeth?" Swell not the torrent of reproach, and calumny, and condemnation, against your brethren, whom the blood of Christ hath ransomed, until—having diligently read their works, and carefully tried them by THE SACRED STANDARD—you feel yourself compelled to lay your hand upon your heart, and say, Guilty, before God, of teaching Popery! Remember who hath said, and under what awful sanctions,

"THOU SHALT NOT BEAR FALSE WITNESS AGAINST THY NEIGHBOUR!"

G. W. D.

Riverside, 10 May, 1841.

O Almighty God, who hast built thy Church upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the head corner-stone; grant us so to be joined together in unity of spirit by their doctrine, that we may be made an holy temple acceptable unto thee, through Jesus Christ our Lord. *Amen.*

A Farther Postscript:

BEING

A RUNNING COMMENTARY

ON THE BISHOP OF ARATH'S

LETTER, ON CHRISTIAN UNION;

ADDRESSED TO

THE BISHOPS OF THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH.

When the foregoing pages were but just printed, and not fifty copies had yet reached the binder's hands, the "Letter on Christian Union, addressed to" "The Right Reverend Bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States," "by the Right Rev. Francis Patrick Kenrick, Bishop of Arath," calling himself "Co-adjutor of the Bishop of Philadelphia" was received, by mail. It needed but a glance to see that this was but another form of the "old trick,"[1] so clumsily played, that it must frustrate its own purpose, and "return to plague the inventor." So much so, that if the account had been entirely closed with the "Pastor" of "Walnut Street," a new one certainly would never have been opened with the "Bishop of Arath." But the present writer holds himself responsible for "even-handed justice." He looks with equal favour on the schismatic of every form. He shrinks from the suspicion of a more profound respect for schism, in a Geneva Cloak, than in a Romish vestment. He only stops the binder, for the briefest space, that he

[1] See p. 4, of the Brief Examination.

may present his compliments, under the same cover, to the Popish Bishop, and the Presbyterian Pastor.

Let it be thought by none that he is rash, in charging schism against the author of the "Letter on Christian Union." It lies upon the very title page. "Letter on Christian Union, addressed to the Bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church, by the Right Rev. Francis Patrick Kenrick, Bishop of Arath." All well enough, so far. But what follows, "and Coadjutor of the Bishop of Philadelphia," is unmitigated schism. There needs no question here as to the aged Bishop,[1] now a resident in Rome, whose coadjutor Bishop Kenrick claims to be? The question is, what business has the Bishop of Arath in the city of Philadelphia? Is it not against all Catholic rule that two Bishops should exercise their functions in one city, unless one be assistant to the other? Was there not a Bishop having jurisdiction in Philadelphia, in 1808, when "the Diocese of Philadelphia," so called, "was created?"[2] Was not the second Bishop, called by whatever name, *in partibus infidelium*, an intruder there? Does not the Bishop of Arath, claiming jurisdiction, or exercising functions, in the diocese of Philadelphia, convict himself, before the world, and in the sight of God, of schism, and worse?

Hear what the Council of Constantinople (A. D. 381) decrees, founded on the previous decision of Nice:

Let not the bishops go out of their diocese, to Churches beyond their bounds, nor cause a confusion of Churches; but, according to the Canons, let the Bishop of Alexandria order the affairs in Egypt only; and the bishops of the East, tne

---

[1] "The present incumbent is the Right Rev. Dr. Conwell, with whom the Right Rev. Dr. Kenrick has been associated, as coadjutor and administrator."—"*Metropolitan Catholic Almanac*," *for* 1841, p. 103.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 103. The charge of schismatical intrusion lies equally against the Papal Vicars Apostolic (for that is the true name) in the dioceses of England, and in the United States; as first in communion with the Church of England, as British Provinces; and then duly organized, as an independent branch of the Church Catholic.

East only; saving the dignity to the Church of Antioch, expressed in the Canons of Nice, &c.

Let not the bishops go out of the diocese for ordination, or any other ecclesiastical offices, *unless they are summoned;* but observing the above-written Canon concerning dioceses, it is clear, that the Synod of each province will manage the affairs according to the decrees of Nice.[1]—*Canon* ii.

Hear the decree of Ephesus, A. D. 438:

Our fellow bishop Rheginus, beloved of God, and the bishops of the province of Cyprus, who are with him, Zeno and Evagrius, beloved of God, have declared a transaction which innovates against the ecclesiastical rules and Canons of the Holy Fathers, and which *touches the liberty of all.* Wherefore, since common disorders require a more effectual remedy, as being productive of greater injury, and especially since *there is no ancient custom alleged for the Bishop of Antioch ordaining in Cyprus*, as these pious men, who have had access to the Holy Synod, have shown, both by books and word of mouth, the prelates of the Churches in Cyprus have the right, uninjured and inviolate, according to the Canons of the Sacred Fathers, and the ancient customs, themselves to confer orders upon the pious bishops; and the same shall be observed in all other dioceses and provinces whatsoever; *so that none of the bishops, beloved of God, take another province, which has not formerly, and from the beginning, been subject to him.* But if any one has taken another, and by force has it placed under his control, *he shall return it;* that the canons of the Fathers be not transgressed, nor the pride of worldly power be introduced under the cloak of the priesthood, nor we *by degrees come to lose that liberty wherewith our Lord Jesus Christ, the deliverer of all men, has endowed us by his own blood.* It seemed good, therefore, to the holy and general Synod, that the proper rights of each province, which have before time from the beginning, by ancient custom, belonged to it, be preserved pure and inviolate.—*Article* vii., commonly called *Canon* viii.

Hear the council of Chalcedon, A. D. 451:

Let not a bishop go into another city or district not pertaining to him, to ordain any one, or to appoint any presbyters or deacons to places subject to

---

[1] I adopt Mr. Perceval's translation. The originals are also given, in his work, "The Roman Schism illustrated, from the Records of the Catholic Church."

another bishop, unless with the consent of the proper bishop of the district. *If any one* DARE *to do otherwise, let the ordination be invalid, and himself be punished by the Synod—Canon,* XXII.

More might be shown, but there are other matters to be noted. Enough is cited now to prove, that neither the Right Rev. Henry Conwell, D.D., nor the Right Rev. Francis Patrick Kenrick, D.D., has any business whatever in the diocese of Pennsylvania, "unless they are summoned;" and that the sooner the latter of them betakes himself to his proper bishopric of Arath—which he has probably not yet visited—the better.

We pass on to the "Letter on Christian Union;" a strange topic for a schismatic interloper in the diocese of a Catholic Bishop, and irresistibly suggesting the quotation;

"Quis tulerit Gracchos de seditione querentis?"

Which may be freely rendered;

How strange, a schismatic should rail at schism!—But, to the Letter!

Right Reverend Sirs: A few years since, some remarks on Christian Union, from the pen of one of your body, led me to address to him a letter, wherein I extended the principles he laid down to what I conceived to be their legitimate consequences. At a later period, an elaborate work, addressed to the Catholic Hierarchy, by another dignitary of your communion, which concluded with overtures for union, emboldened me to write a treatise in defence of *the Primacy of the Apostolical See, which is the essential centre of Catholic unity.* Neither the letter nor the treatise has been noticed by either of the prelates.—p. 3.

There may be several reasons readily imagined why neither of the prelates should have noticed either treatise. Of one of them, the rumour was, that it found small favour at the Court of Rome. Hence, perhaps, the superserviceable zeal of this epistle! Hence, perhaps, the eager haste to charge the second sentence of the letter with this ponderous sentence, "the Primacy of the Apostolic See,

which is the essential centre of Catholic unity." A singular specimen of economy in sophistry; since, in scarcely more than a single line, there are condensed no less than three complete and perfect specimens of what logicians call *petitio principii.*

It is by no means granted that the See of Rome is, in the sense intended by the Bishop of Arath, "*the* Apostolic See."

It is by no means granted that the See of Rome enjoys a "Primacy" of other sees.

It is by no means granted that the See of Rome is "the essential centre of Catholic unity."

Of course, there is no call on any one to enter into controversy with assertions, merely. The pretty figure of a "centre of Catholic unity" shall have attention by and by. It may suffice meanwhile to say, that nothing was known of the Primacy of Rome at the first General Council; which decreed as follows:

Let the ancient customs prevail, which are in Egypt, Libya and Pentapolis; that the Bishop of Alexandria have authority over all, since this is customary also to the Bishop of Rome. In like manner also as regards Antioch, and in all the other provinces, let the Churches preserve their dignity.[1]—*Sixth Canon at Nice.*

Nothing was known at the Second General Council of any other superiority at Rome, than that which sprung from its metropolitan character; since it decreed as follows:

Let the Bishop of Constantinople have rank, next after the Bishop of Rome; *for Constantinople is New Rome.*[2]

---

[1] "At the Council of Chalcedon," says Mr. Perceval, (see Labbe and Cossart, iv. 811,) "an attempt was made, on the part of the representative of the Bishop of Rome, to substitute a spurious edition of this Canon, beginning thus,—'The Church of Rome always held the primacy.' But the attempt was defeated at the time, by a copy of the Canon belonging to the Archdeacon of Constantinople; and none of the Greek codes countenanced it: so that it has been universally rejected."

[2] When a kinsman of Lord Mansfield was made a judge, and, feeling his incompetency to the office, asked advice of him; he answered, 'pronounce your

As little notion had the majority of the Bishops at that council, assembled the year after, of the Primacy of Rome; since their synodical Epistle to the Western Bishops, assembled at Rome, declares as follows:

We acknowledge the most venerable Cyril, most beloved of God, to be Bishop of the Church at Jerusalem, which is the mother of all Churches.

As little did the fourth of the General Councils know of any claim which Rome had to the Primacy, through the Apostle Peter; since it thus declares:

We every where following the decrees of the Holy Fathers, and acknowledging the Canon which has just been read of the 150 Bishops, most dear to God, do also decree and vote the same things concerning the precedency of the most holy Church of Constantinople, New Rome; for the Fathers, with reason, gave the precedency to the throne of Old Rome, because it was the imperial city.—Canon of Chalcedon, xxviii.

Awkward things, it must be owned, these reasons are, for those who find assertions better for their purpose! But this is all preliminary. The gist of this benevolent epistle is what follows.

In the meantime, controversy beyond the Atlantic has taken a retrograde march, and, in a celebrated English university, several points of ancient faith and discipline have been vindicated with much learning; popular errors and prejudices have been attacked and overthrown; and principles have been put forward, which the admirers of the new school, as well as its adversaries, seem now to regard as the preliminaries to peace and concord between the Anglican Establishment and the Roman Catholic Church. p. 3.

And so the Oxford Tracts have brought together the Popish Bishop and the Presbyterian Pastor! As it is written, in Holy Scripture, "And the same day Pilate and Herod were made friends together;

---

judgments confidently, but beware of giving the reasons for them." If the first council of Constantinople, had omitted the reason for its judgment, it had served Rome better.

for before they were at enmity between themselves." A strange result this, for "a retrograde march!" But not more strange than that the Bishop of Arath should regard such sentences as these—"an union is impossible; their communion is infected with heterodoxy, we are bound to flee it as a pestilence; they have established a lie in the place of God's truth, and, by their claim of immutability in doctrine, cannot undo the sin they have committed; they cannot repent; Popery must be destroyed, it cannot be reformed"[1]—"as the preliminaries to peace and concord," even in the judgment of what he calls "the admirers of the new school," "between the Anglican establishment and the Roman Catholic Church." Is it too much to say, with Chillingworth,[2] of an insinuation so utterly unfounded—"what effect it may have wrought, what aid it may have gained with credulous Papists, (who dream what they desire, and believe their own dreams,) or with ill-affected, jealous, and weak Protestants, I cannot tell; but one thing I dare say boldly, that *you yourself did never believe it.*"

The late tract of the Rev. Mr. Newman not obscurely favours the infallible authority of Catholic councils, which he carefully distinguishes from convocations by royal authority,[3] the inspiration of

---

[1] Tracts for the Times, No. xx. [2] See Brief Examination, pp. 150, 151.

[3] "General councils, then, may err, *unless* in any case it is promised, as a matter of express supernatural privilege, that they shall *not* err. . . . . Such a promise, however, *does* exist in cases when general councils are not only gathered together according to 'the commandment and will of princes,' but in the *name* of Christ, according to our Lord's promise. The Article merely contemplates the human prince, not the King of Saints. While councils are a thing of earth, their infallibility of course is not guaranteed; when they are a thing of heaven, their deliberations are overruled, and their decrees authoritative. In such cases, they are *Catholic* councils . . . . what those *conditions* are which fulfil the notion of a gathering 'in the name of Christ' in the case of a particular council, it is not necessary here to determine. Some have included, among these conditions, the subsequent reception of its decrees by the Universal Church; others a ratification by the Pope."—pp. 21, 22.

the books called Deutero-Canonical, the seven sacraments, purgatory and prayers for the dead, indulgences, invocation of saints, the real presence,[1] the sacrifice of mass,[2] and other controverted doctrines. Whilst appearing to wish to guard the members of the Establishment from straggling towards Rome, he sufficiently betrays a desire to re-establish all the ancient doctrines in the Anglican Church, that thus it may be prepared for returning to the communion of the Catholic Church. He remarks that the leading spirits of the age have observed the many indications of a general desire to return to something that is only to be found in the Church of Rome,—the reverential awe for the mysteries of faith, and the tenderness of Christian devotion.[3] The measures which have followed the appear-

---

[1] The "Homilies" occupy the 11th section of the Tract, and numerous extracts are given from them to prove that,—

"The authority of the fathers, of the first six councils, and of the judgments of the Church generally, the holiness of the primitive Church, the inspiration of the apocrypha, the sacramental character of marriage, and other ordinances the real presence in the Eucharist, the Church's power of excommunicating kings, the profitableness of fasting, the propitiatory virtue of good works, the Eucharistic commemoration, and justification by inherent righteousness, are taught in the Homilies."—p. 75.

[2] Mr. Newman maintains that the 31st Article against masses—"Neither speaks against the mass in itself, nor against it being an offering for the quick and the dead for the remission of sin; but against its being viewed on the one hand as independent of, or distinct from, the sacrifice of the cross, which is blasphemy; and on the other, its being directed to the emolument of those to whom it pertains to celebrate it, which is imposture, in addition."—p. 63.

[3] "In truth, there is at this moment a great progress of the religious mind of our Church to something deeper and truer than satisfied the last century. I always have contended, and will contend, that it is not satisfactorily accounted for by any particular movements of individuals on a particular spot. The poets and philosophers of the age have borne witness to it many years. Those great names in our literature, Sir Walter Scott, Mr. Wordsworth, Mr. Coleridge, though in different ways, and with essential differences one from another, and perhaps from any Church system, still all bear witness to it. Mr. Alexander Knox, in Ireland, bears a most surprising witness to it. The system of Mr. Irving is another witness to it. The age is moving towards something; and most unhappily, the one religious communion among us, which has of late years been practically in possession of this something, IS THE CHURCH OF

ance of this extraordinary publication, confirm the belief that his views are not peculiar. The mildness of the censures passed on the work, is indicative of no very hostile feeling; and if it has been thought expedient to disavow it in a semi-official manner, and to direct the discontinuance of the publication of the Tracts, there is much to persuade us that these are purely measures of expediency. The tone of the Tracts has found an echo on this side of the Atlantic; and some appear willing to follow whither they are led by their Oxford brethren, even though it be to Rome.—pp. 4, 5.

We enter into no discussion with Bishop Kenrick, as to the Ninetieth Tract for the Times. If he has read it, which he no where says, he is more fortunate than we thus far have been. Thus much we venture to conclude: if he had had access to it, and found it to his purpose, he certainly would have used more of it. He never would have limited his extracts to the heads of arguments, if he had liked the arguments themselves. Of Mr. Newman's Letter to Dr. Jelf, while we have Dr. Hook's statement, that the explanation in it of the Ninetieth Tract was to his mind "perfectly satisfactory,"[1] it will take more than Bishop Kenrick's praise to cause us any distrust. For the rest, there needs no better illustration than the Bishop's fellow-helper, Mr. Boardman, has afforded, how much may be accomplished, by adroit quotation, with a proper mixture of *Italics* and of exclamations—think of a Bishop using them in triplets!—towards making "the worse appear the better reason." As for the Bishop of Arath's show of taking the censure of "the Hebdomadal Board" as but a trick, to ease the matter off, it makes one think of an old proverb, which one does not like to quote upon a Bishop. "The tone of the Tracts *has* found an echo on this side of the Atlantic." Of the

---

Rome. (!!!) She *alone*, amid all the errors and evils of her practical system, *has given free scope to the feelings of awe, mystery, tenderness, reverence, devotedness, and other feelings, which may be especially called Catholic.*"—Letter to Dr. Jelf.

[1] Brief Examination, p. 184.

readiness of any here to follow, "whither they are led by their Oxford brethren, even though it be to Rome"—

"Thy wish was father, Harry, to that thought!"—

the pages which precede this Postscript may be taken as a proof.

The crisis has seemed to me opportune for soliciting your co-operation, Right Reverend Sirs, to effect a reconciliation with the Parent Church, and, at the risk of appearing obtrusive, I venture to submit some considerations which may recommend it to your serious attention. I disclaim most sincerely all wish to provoke a controversy, as I imagine that enough has been written on both sides to satisfy every enquirer; and the only thing worth writing about at present seems to me to be the means of effecting a union. Hitherto most persons have despaired of its possibility, in consequence of the ever-widening breach, and of the failure of many efforts made to reunite the discordant communions; but present circumstances are peculiarly propitious, and every effort for such a purpose is laudable, whatever be the chance of success. The advantages of union are acknowledged. It would be more comforting to the Christian to be sustained in his belief by the consent of millions, than to remain isolated in the convictions of his own mind, or to be distracted by the discord of large bodies of Christian professors, at variance on most important points of revelation. It would exhibit the evidences of Christianity with increased lustre, if not only its general truth were admitted, but its doctrines received with equal unanimity; and the infidel's sarcasm, so often directed against the dissensions of believers, would lose its point, and his homage would be won for religion. The waters of bitterness would cease to flow from the fountain from which the sweet stream of living waters should alone issue; the scandals of controversial strife would no longer disfigure the unity of Christian teaching; the mutual recriminations and calumnies of jarring sects would be heard no more; and peace and charity would commence their golden reign. How good and how pleasant would it not be to abide as brethren in unity! How great a triumph for the Gospel were all its professors as one great family, having but one heart and one soul! The infidel would involuntarily exclaim at the sight:—"How beautiful are thy tabernacles, O Jacob,

and thy tents, O Israel! As woody valleys, as watered gardens near the rivers, as tabernacles which the Lord hath pitched, as cedars by the water-side.—pp. 6, 7.

This were an admirable passage, were it only honest. Alas, it is the case which David has described before! "The words of his mouth were smoother than butter, but war was in his heart: his words were softer than oil, yet were they drawn swords." Most unworthy of his high office, most unbecoming his position as a scholar and a gentleman, most inconsistent with that "simplicity and godly sincerity" which are the most immediate graces of the Christian character, yet in most perfect keeping with the teaching and the practice of the subtle school from which he springs, is Bishop Kenrick's course. He has seen the progress made at Oxford, to arouse the Church of England to a sense of her true posture, as an ancient Church. He has seen the impulse which the Oxford writings have communicated to the English mind, to search and stand in the old paths. He has seen that every where her truest sons were girding up their loins, and buckling on their armour, for that conflict, on the ground of "holy Scripture" and of "ancient authors," in which Rome must fall. He has heard the expostulations of the timid, he has heard the reproaches of the rash, he has heard the calumnies of the censorious, among those who swell the ranks, while they impair the strength, of Protestantism. He has resolved to turn the controversy to account: and, cringing to the cause which in his heart he scorns, has basely sought to prejudice, by his pretended patronage, the party in the conflict which alone he fears. No thought has he that any Bishop whom he ventures to address will ever look the way his pamphlet points. No thought has he that any scholar, much less any theologian, will listen for a moment to his sophistry. But the wavering may be shaken, the weak may be perplexed, the ignorant may be misled. At all events, the timid will be terrified, the prejudiced embittered, the enemy blas-

pheme. Brief though the triumph be, it will be something. The loss to England, however small it be, is gain to Rome. Next to his own advantage—nay, beyond it, to the envious and malignant—is his adversary's harm. And for such an end, and in the furtherance of such a spirit, such words of seeming love and tenderness are uttered; even as "Satan himself is transformed into an angel of light!" "The sanctifying end" says Mr. Faber,"[1] in a case not much unlike the present one, "was good; and the Latin prelate does not seem to have been particularly scrupulous about the means."

I do not conceive that discussion, either oral or written, is the means most likely to bring about the desirable union. So amply have the points of controversy been investigated by men of the most powerful intellect and deep research, that little additional light can be thrown on them. The dispassionate lecture of their works, after earnest prayer to God, seems best calculated to produce unity of sentiment, in regard to the tenets in question, and to the principle of Church authority, without the recognition of which any coincidence in special doctrines would not secure the end. Unless the Church be admitted to be "the pillar and ground of the truth," the faithful witness of revelation, the unerring judge of doctrine, all efforts to unite in communion must necessarily be nugatory. We should have no sure motive on which to ground our assent to the revealed doctrines. and no safeguard against division. With the same facility wherewith certain tenets are admitted as derived from scripture, and consonant with the faith of antiquity, they might be speedily rejected by the revolting pride of individuals or societies, wanting the principle of authority whereon to repose. Hence, this has been correctly styled by an old controversial writer, "the shortest way to end disputes about Religion;" and it has given occasion to the excellent work of the celebrated Milner, "The End of Controversy," than which I know of nothing better suited to satisfy persons of intelligence and learning on this important topic, and thereby to dispose them for unity of faith. May I recommend it then for serious perusal?—pp. 7,8.

---

[1] Difficulties of Romanism, p. xxii.

Ingenuous Dr. Kenrick! Discussion can do nothing to accomplish union! There needs no farther argument! The points are all decided. "Unless the Church be admitted to be the pillar and ground of the truth, the faithful witness of revelation, and the unerring judge of doctrine, all efforts to unite in communion must necessarily be nugatory." Therefore, by all means read "the *excellent* work of the *celebrated* Milner, 'The End of Controversy;' than which I know of nothing better suited to *satisfy* persons of intelligence and learning, on this important topic, and thereby to dispose them for unity of faith. May I recommend it then for serious perusal?" And this "addressed to the Bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church!" I cannot find it in my heart not to enforce this high eulogium by a single specimen. "Every time," says Dr. Milner, speaking of the members of the Anglican Church, "they address the God of truth, either in solemn worship, or in private devotion, they are forced each of them to repeat, *I believe in the Catholic Church.* And yet, if I ask any of them the question, Are you *a Catholic?* he is sure to answer me, No, I am a *Protestant.* Was there ever a more glaring instance of inconsistency and self-condemnation among rational beings?"[1]—There 's an "end of controversy" for you! Would any one desire a more "excellent work?" Can any one conceive of an author more "celebrated?" "May I recommend it then for serious perusal?" Certainly, you may!

The unerring authority of the Catholic Church in matters of faith being once admitted, the union would be easily accomplished. The special tenets would all be embraced on this principle, whilst they would at the same time be sustained by the most satisfactory evidence from Scripture and tradition. In the detailed review of them, care should be taken to confine ourselves to the strict definitions of faith,

[1] End of Religious Controversy, letter xxv.

and not at all to mingle with them the opinions of theologians, however respectable and weighty. The profession of faith, published by the authority of Pius IV., embraces all that is proposed for our belief on the points of controversy agitated in the sixteenth century; and a reference to the decrees of the Council of Trent can be made by those who desire to see further details. If union be desired, our differences should be simplified to the greatest degree possible; and no one should be called on to believe more than what is clearly defined, or to reject what the authority of the Catholic Church has not condemned. To begin by requiring disclaimers of odious tenets, which have been unjustly imputed to us, or disavowals of theological opinions, which are free, is not to promote union, but to throw obstacles in its way. Let us plainly see what is precisely necessary to be believed, as of faith; and if there be no just objection to the terms of the definitions, let us not refuse to unite, because of the practical abuses that are alleged to be built on them.—pp. 8, 9.

There is no such agreement in the world as when one has all things the way one likes. What simpler recipe for "Christian union" than is brought to us from Arath? The profession of faith, published by the authority of Pius IV, has but to be taken as the interpreter of "the unerring authority of the Catholic Church in matters of faith;" with "a reference to the decrees of the council of Trent," for "those who desire to see farther details," and there is an "end of controversy!" But there are two words to that bargain. What saith the third General Council, A. D. 438, of those who make new Creeds?

The Holy Synod determined that it should not be lawful for any one to set forth, write or compose any other creed than that which was determined by the holy Fathers who assembled at Nice, in the Holy Ghost; and that if any shall dare to compose any other creed, or adduce or present it to those who are willing to be converted to the knowledge of the truth, either from heathenism or Judaism, or any heresy whatsoever; such persons, if Bishops, shall be deprived of their Episcopal office.—*Action* vi.

And, in the second place, to look a little at these same details. The Church of Rome teaches, through her Creed of Pope Pius, authorized at Trent, A. D. 1563:

That they are accursed, who do not honour, salute, and honourably worship the holy and venerable images.

That they are accursed, who do not believe that Christ is present in the Holy Eucharist, by way of transubstantiation; or who affirm that after the consecration the substance of the bread and wine remain in the consecrated elements.

That they are accursed, who do not believe that there is a purgatory.

That they are accursed, who do not receive for sacred and Canonical, the books of Tobit, Judith, Wisdom, Ecclesiastes, Baruch, two of Maccabees, and the additions to the Book of Daniel, to wit, the story of Susanna, the song of the three children, and the history of Bel and the Dragon.

That they are accursed, who deny that confirmation, repentance, extreme unction, orders and matrimony, are truly and properly sacraments.

That they are accursed, who deny that the Church of Rome is the mother and mistress of all Churches.

That they are accursed, who refuse obedience to the Bishop of Rome.

That they are accursed, who shall deny that whole and entire Christ, body and blood, soul and divinity, is contained at the same time in every species of bread in the Eucharist, and in every particle thereof; and in every species of wine in the Eucharist, and in every particle thereof.

That they are accursed, who shall deny that Christ, in the Eucharist, ought to be carried about and exhibited to the people.

That they are accursed, who shall deny that sacramental confession to the priests, of every sin, was ordained by Christ, and is by divine authority necessary for forgiveness.

That they are accursed, who shall affirm that the sacramental absolution of the priest is a ministerial and not a judicial act.

That they are accursed, who shall say that the anointing of the sick does not confer grace.

That they are accursed, who shall say, that all and each of Christ's faithful people ought to receive both species of the most holy sacrament of the Eucharist.

That they are accursed, who shall say that the clergy may contract marriages.

That they are accursed, who shall deny that the saints departed are to be invoked.

That they are accursed, who shall deny the utility of indulgences.

"A mouth full of curses," truly! How many of the Bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church, does he of Arath think, will "echo," or subscribe to, them? Who will not own the sentence mild, which pronounces a Church requiring such terms of communion—unauthorized by Scripture, unauthorized by General Councils, unauthorized by Ancient Doctors—to be in schism?

The celebrated writers of the Oxford Tracts admit that the doctrine proposed by the council of Trent, concerning Purgatory, is such as against which, taken in the letter, they should scarcely be able to sustain an objection; but they allege that its practical influence is widely different. For union the admission of no mere opinion is necessary; the approbation of no abuse is desired; even the practical operation of the tenet is not proposed for approval; the dogma alone is to be considered; and if this be admissible, it will be for those who embrace it to concur in giving to it the purest and best influence. Let me then entreat all who yearn after Christian unity, to seek with great singleness of purpose this "one faith," and entirely to set aside all considerations which might encumber or embarrass the investigation. I cannot persuade myself that this is unattainable, where sincerity and love of unity exist.—p. 9.

Very accommodating, indeed! What "the celebrated writers of the Oxford Tracts" *do* say is as follows:

"Such is the Roman doctrine;[1] and taken in the *mere letter* there is little in it against which we shall be able to maintain formal objections. Purgatory is

---

[1] The words are from the decree of the Council of Trent, session 25, which are as follows: "Whereas the Church Catholic, fully instructed by the Holy Ghost, hath from the sacred Scriptures, and ancient tradition of the Fathers in sacred Councils, and last of all in this present Œcumenical Synod, taught that there is a Purgatory, and that souls there detained are aided by the suf-

not spoken of at all, as a place of pain; it need only mean what its name implies, a place of purification. There is, indeed, much presumption, in asserting definitively, that there is such a place; and assuredly there is not only presumption, but very great daring, and uncharitableness in including belief in it, as Pope Pius' Creed goes on to do, among the conditions of salvation; but if we would consider it as confined to the mere opinion, that that good which is begun on earth, is perfected in the next world, the term would be tolerable. The word *detentas* indeed expresses a somewhat stronger idea; yet, after all, hardly more than that the souls in Purgatory would be happier out of it than in it, and that they cannot of their own will leave it; which is not much to grant. Further, that the prayers of the living benefit the dead in Christ, is, to say the least, not inconsistent, as Ussher shows us, with the primitive belief. So much as to the *letter* of the decree; but it is not safe to go by the letter: on the contrary we are bound to take the universal and uniform doctrine taught and received *in* the Roman Communion, as the real and true interpreter of words which in themselves, are comparatively innocent. What that doctrine is, may be gathered from the words of the Catechism of Trent, in which the spirit of Romanism, not being bound by the rules which shackle it in the council, speaks out. The account of Purgatory which that formulary supplies shall here be taken as our text, and Cardinal Bellarmine's defence, shall be read as a comment upon it.

---

frages of the living, and above all, by the acceptable sacrifice of the altar, this holy Synod enjoins on Bishops, to make diligent efforts that the sound doctrine concerning Purgatory, handed down from the holy Fathers and sacred Councils, be believed, maintained, taught, and every where proclaimed, by the disciples of Christ. At the same time, as regards the uneducated multitude, let the more difficult and subtle questions, such as tend not to edification, nor commonly increase piety, be excluded from popular discourses. Moreover, let them disallow the publication and discussion of whatever is uncertain or suspicious; and prohibit whatever is of a curious or superstitious nature, or savours of filthy lucre, as the scandals and stumbling blocks of believers. And let them provide that the suffrages of believers living, that is, the sacrifices of masses, prayers, alms, and other works of piety, which believers living are wont to perform for other believers dead, be performed according to the rules of the Church, piously and religiously; and whatever are due for them from the endowments of testators, or in other way be fulfilled, not in a perfunctory way, but diligently and accurately by the Priest and Ministers of the Church, and others who are bound to do this service."

The Catechism then speaks as follows; 'There is a Purgatorial fire, in which the souls of the pious are tormented for a certain time, and cleansed, in order that an entrance may be open to them, into their eternal home, into which nothing defiled enters.'

In like manner Bellarmine says, 'Purgatory is a certain place, in which, as if in a prison, souls are purged after this life, which have not been fully purged in it, in order (that is) that thus purged they may be enabled to enter heaven, which nothing defiled shall enter.' A painful light is at once cast by these comments on the synodal decree. 'There is a Purgatory,' in the decree, is interpreted by Bellarmine, 'there *is* a sort of prison;' and by the Catechism, 'there is a purgatorial fire.' And whereas, the decree merely says that souls are '*detained* there,' the Catechism says, that they are 'tormented and cleansed.'"

With this comparison of the Oxford Tracts, when speaking for themselves, with the Oxford Tracts, when interpreted after the manner of Arath, one can easily account for so much earnestness in the entreaty, "to set aside all considerations, which might encumber or embarrass the investigation." The Papal Church is famous for simplicity of practice. Believe, or burn! The dogma, or damnation! These are her favourite formulæ.

May I suggest the propricty of repeating daily that beautiful prayer which the Church uses on the third Sunday after Easter?—"O God, who dost show the light of thy truth to those that are in error, that they may return to the path of justice, grant to all that profess the Christian faith, to reject all that is opposed to this profession, and to embrace all that is conformable to it, through our Lord Jesus Christ," etc. This prayer is most suitable at this time, and might with great propriety be repeated daily by all who desire Christian unity. The prayers offered up on the Continent of Europe and in England for the return of the English nation to its ancient faith, may well be imitated by us; and, with still more enlarged views, we may, in these words, supplicate the same blessings for all the wandering children of error. I hope that the Catholics of this country will not fail to offer up their most fervent supplications for this purpose: as it is to prayer alone that this grace will be granted, that the glory may redound to God alone.—**pp. 9, 10.**

There can be no objection to this prayer; now, and at all times. Nor are we of those who take amiss the prayers of any, offered in sincerity. It seems a little odd, however, that the Bishop of Arath, in a letter to Bishops who agree in doctrine, discipline and worship with the Church of England, should speak of praying "for the return of the English nation to its ancient faith." "The Catholics of this country" will be contented, if the Church of England and themselves may but be kept established in the faith which, at the Reformation, was asserted at the stake by Cranmer, Latimer and Ridley.

It may appear that all hope of union is taken away, by requiring an unreserved submission to all the doctrines of faith; but it is impossible that any real union could be hoped for, on any other condition. To attempt any compromise would be to betray the interests of truth, and to destroy all security for its maintenance. If the sacrifice of favorite opinions to integrity be deemed too great for human pride or weakness, let it be remembered that it is not made to man, but to God. The homage is rendered to his wisdom, that has provided this safeguard for revelation. There is no room for human triumph. We can claim nothing for ourselves, since "we are not sufficient to think any thing of ourselves as of ourselves." Faith is the gift of God, and is not the mere effort of superior intellect, or the reward of a better disposition of heart. It is bestowed by an unsearchable dispensation of divine mercy; and the very correspondence of man to grace is ultimately to be referred to the unmerited bounty of God. "O the depth of the riches of the wisdom and of the knowledge of God! How incomprehensible are his judgments, and how unsearchable his ways!" God forbid that we should glory in ourselves, or that we should seek the gratification of personal vanity in your return to the unity of the Church. It would be the triumph of divine truth over human error; and it would become us to glorify God, wonderful and merciful in all his dispensations. We regard your errors not as the wanton inventions of proud and corrupt minds, but as the unhappy legacy left by those who wandered beyond the limits placed by the fathers: and we should unite with

you in deploring them, mingling our tears with your tears,—whilst you, being made partakers of our joy, should unite with us in proclaiming the praises of God, whose mercy is confirmed upon us, and whose truth abideth for ever. It is not for us to form a human coalition by mutual sacrifices; but it is our duty to maintain the eternal covenant of God, whose truth suffers no adulteration—whose institutions cannot be remodelled by man.—pp. 10, 11.

All this is very well. We thank the Bishop for his charitable interpretation of our errors; only wondering, that, in the midst of such a strain, the thought of "personal vanity" could find admission, or the occasion be imagined for disclaiming "human triumph." There is no worthier object of our prayers than for the union of Christians. We do not look upon it as beyond our hope. We candidly admit that progress has been made towards it by the wide spread of Oxford influence. Not, at Rome, however, will the junction be effected, but at Jerusalem. The basis of that union will not be the decrees of Trent, nor yet the Creed of Pius; but the "faith once" for all "delivered to the saints." When Rome will meet us on the rule of Vincent, "Quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus," we will embrace her, with arms open, and a melting heart. Till then, we bide our time. "It is not for *us* to form a human coalition by mutual sacrifices; but it is our duty to maintain the eternal covenant of God, whose truth suffers no adulteration," as by Rome; "whose institutions cannot be remodelled by man," as at Trent.

The admission of the doctrinal tenets implies the fundamental principles of Church organization.—p. 11.

This we most readily allow. Our system is "THE GOSPEL IN THE CHURCH."

It is defined by the Council of Trent, that there is a hierarchy constituted by divine ordination, and consisting of Bishops, Priests, and Ministers. p. 11.

This, too, we admit in all sincerity; and state it better, in the language of the Preface to our Ordinal; "It is apparent to all men diligently reading Holy Scripture and ancient authors, that from the Apostles' time there has been these orders of Ministers in Christ's Church, Bishops, Priests and Deacons."

The power of the Bishop of Rome, as successor of St. Peter, over all the Church, is defined by the Council of Florence, and is embraced in the profession of faith, which contains a promise of true obedience to the vicar of Jesus Christ. Against the admission of this authority, the strongest prejudices are, I know, enlisted.—p. 11.

"Prejudices," indeed! And pray who makes the dictionaries in Arath, that they supply no better word than this? "Prejudices," quotha? We sympathise with Gregory, surnamed the Great, first Roman Bishop of that name, upon this subject. "What," saith he, writing to the Bishop of Constantinople, who had admitted the title of Universal Bishop, "What wilt thou say to Christ, the head of the Universal Church, in the trial of the last judgment, who by the appellation of Universal dost endeavour to subject all his members to thee? Whom, I pray, dost thou mean to imitate, in so perverse a word, but him, who, despising the lessons of angels constituted in fellowship with him, did endeavor to break forth into the top of singularity, that he might be subject to none, and alone be over all? Who also said, I will ascend unto heaven, and exalt my throne above the stars * * * * * * for what are thy brethren, all the bishops of the Universal Church, but the stars of heaven; to whom by this haughty word thou desired to prefer thyself, and to trample on their name in comparison to thee, what dost thou say, but I will climb into heaven?"[1] And again, "I confidently say, that whoso-

---

[1] So translated in Barrow on the Supremacy of the Pope (Clarendon Press Edition of his works) vi. 205.

ever doth call himself universal Bishop, or desireth to be so called, doth in his elation forerun Antichrist, because he perversely doth set himself above all others."[1]

The decree of the Council of Florence, A. D. 1438, is in these words;

Also we decree that the holy Apostolic See, and the Roman Pontiff, has a primacy over the whole world; and that the Roman Pontiff himself is the successor of St. Peter, the Prince of the Apostles, and is the true vicar of Christ, and head of the whole Church, and the Father and teacher of all Christians; and that to him, in the person of the blessed Peter, our Lord Jesus Christ has committed full power of feeding, ruling, and governing the universal Church.—*Session* xxv.

A summary settlement of an important subject, but not entirely satisfactory. How is it, if to the See of Rome belongs "a primacy over the whole world," that the Council of Nice, (p. 193.) placed Antioch and Alexandria on the same ground precisely; and that the first of Constantinople, (p. 193.) to inquire no further, ratified the judgment? How is it, if to the Roman Pontiff,as "successor of St. Peter," this Primacy of power belongs, that the first of Constantinople (p. 193.) refers his higher rank entirely to his metropolitan position; and Chalcedon (p. 194.) does precisely the same thing, for precisely the same reason? How is it, if the Roman Pontiff is "the true Vicar of Christ, and head of the whole Church," with "full power of feeding ruling, and governing, the Universal Church," that neither Nice, (p. 191,) nor Constantinople (p. 190,) nor Ephesus, (p. 191,) nor Chalcedon, (p. 191,) in limiting all Bishops to their proper districts, makes no exception in the case of Rome? These things are not for us to reconcile.

"Non nostrum tantas componere lites:"

but theirs, who, with such perfect self complacency, declare, with

[1] Barrow vi. 205, 6.

Bishop Kenrick, and count on their believing it, who have learnt how to read, that "the power of the Bishop of Rome, as successor of St. Peter over all the Church, is defined by the Council of Florence;" and challenge, upon that definition, universal and entire obedience. "Against the admission of this authority," the Bishop of Arath may rest assured, there is much more enlisted than "the strongest prejudices:" the voice of God, as heard in Holy Scripture; and its confirmation, in the uniform consent of all antiquity.

The Oxford Divines themselves, who have shown no great reluctance to admit almost all our other tenets which were formerly contested with great warmth, have scarcely ventured to touch the very delicate point of Papal supremacy. Yet this is the rock on which the whole edifice of Christianity rests in immoveable firmness; this is the essential centre of unity, around which all the faithful must gather in harmony of faith and obedience. For three centuries the experiment has been made, to dispense with this conservative power: and the result has been that every separated mass has been broken into numberless fragments. And, may I ask, what is there in this authority that should shock prejudice? Its absolute undefined nature: its interference with liberty and independence. There can be no power in the Church of God, since the divine revelation and law put limits which none can remove. The Vicar of Jesus Christ is powerless against the truth; all his power being in support of it. His power is for edification, not for destruction, and tends essentially to combine and preserve in unity all the members of Christ. With civil liberty and independence it interferes no further than the divine law puts bounds to human power, and says to the pride of man: 'Thus far thou shalt go, and here thou shalt break thy swelling waves.'—pp. 11. 12.

This is a passage which, on more accounts than one, is very curious. "The Oxford Divines themselves who have shown no great reluctance to admit almost all our other tenets"—see pages 30—34, of the Brief Examination, in connexion with this clause—"have scarcely ventured to touch the very delicate point of Papal su-

premacy." "Some points of it," (Popery) says Mr. Boardman, "as for example *the supremacy of the Pontiff*, the schismatical position of the Romish Church, in its relation to the 'Anglo Catholic Church,' transubstantiation, &c., *they attack manfully: one broadside follows another*, until the reader really begins to fancy they are the boldest of all the 'champions' who have entered the lists against that antichristian hierarchy," (quoted in p. 24, Brief Examination.) Between Bishop Kenrick's "scarcely ventured to touch," and Mr. Boardman's "broadside after broadside," there is an obvious difference, doubtless. But one may get used to knocks, and scarcely feel them. The Oxford writers have unquestionably dwelt at greater length upon some other points than this of Romish error: perhaps as less palpably repugnant to all Scripture and to all Catholic tradition; and so, more dangerous. But more will judge with Mr. Boardman, than with Bishop Kenrick; when informed that, of their teaching, on this "very delicate point," the following are samples:

"The claim of the Pope to be universal Bishop, is against Scripture and antiquity."—Tract for the Times, 38, p. 11.

What more could it be?

And again:—

"That there is not a word in Scripture about our duty to obey the Pope, is quite clear. The Papists indeed, say that he is the successor of St. Peter; and that, therefore, he is head of all Bishops, because St. Peter bore rule over the other Apostles.[1] But though the Bishops of Rome were often called the successors of St. Peter in the early Church, yet every other Bishop had the same title, and though it be true that St. Peter was the *foremost* of the Apostles, that does not prove that he had any dominion over them. * * * * * And so Rome has ever had what is called the *primacy* of the Christian Churches; but it has not, therefore, any right to interfere in their internal administration."—Tract 15, p. 5.

[1] As when St. Paul withstood him to the face, Galatians ii. 11.—G. W. D.

But, in a moment, what a change! "*The very delicate point* of Papal supremacy"—a vanishing point, in every Catholic eye—becomes, in the next sentence, "*the rock* on which the whole edifice of Christianity rests in immoveable firmness; this is the essential centre of unity, around which all the faithful *must* [*?*] gather in harmony of faith and obedience." In our old fashioned way of thinking, we had supposed, with Paul, that "the whole edifice of Christianity" rested on "the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief corner stone." But they have changed all this in Arath. Apostles and prophets and Jesus Christ himself, in their philosophy, must all give place "to the very delicate point of Papal supremacy!" "The essential centre of unity!"—a pretty figure, doubtless, were it true; and to be turned, in prose or poetry, to very good account! But how was it when there were two Popes? Were there then two "essential" centres? Or, which was which? And where is the authority for such a figure? A wordy, bungling writer, in the "Encyclopedia Americana," (article, *Roman Catholic Church*,) says, that "this primacy, according to all the traditions of the apostles, rests in the person of the Roman Bishop, as the successor of St. Peter, whom Christ made the rock of his Church; *that is*, the immoveable centre of his visible Church." This seems to be the notion prevalent in Arath, and perhaps the article itself was written there. The allusion, doubtless, is to Cyprian, *de Unitate Ecclesiæ;* though not one word is there in that or any of his writings, of a supremacy of power and dignity in Peter; much less of its descent, from him who never had it, to the Bishop of Rome; much less of *his* being the essential centre of unity: but exactly the reverse. Even in the very passage which the advocates of Rome rely on most—and which, that they might more rely on it, there is strong suspicion that they have interpolated, to adapt it to their use—the power conveyed to Peter is expressly said to have been

given to all the apostles, and the rest of the apostles are declared to be what Peter was. "The rest of the apostles were, indeed, what Peter was: endowed with an equal fellowship both of dignity and power." *Hoc erant utique et cæteri Apostoli, quod fuit Petrus, pari consortio prædíti et honoris et potestatis.* Words, than which none could possibly be used more clearly to deny that supremacy which the Council of Florence, in 1438, attributes to the Pope.[1]

"For three centuries, the experiment has been made, the Bishop tells us, to dispense with this conservative power." *Only* for three centuries? It was in 590, that the great Gregory became the Bishop of Rome; the same who said, as has been before cited, that whoever

---

[1] There is nothing which more clearly shows how Rome has fallen, than her continual appeal to ignorance. This is not the place to show it. The reader is referred, for samples, to Mr. Newman against Romanism and Popular Protestantism. So far has she pursued it, as to induce the vulgar belief, that all the Fathers are with her: and bring on him who cites the Fathers the suspicion, ipso facto, that he leans to Rome. Take, as an illustration, the tract of Cyprian, on the unity of the Church. The crafty Romanists, would use it to establish the unity of the Catholic Church, *as subjected to the one Bishop of Rome.* Even were this a fact, what could Cyprian's treatise have to do with it? The Church at Rome was rent most fearfully by the Novatian schism. The authority of Cornelius, the canonically consecrated Bishop, was invaded by Novatian; who had been clandestinely, and of course not canonically, consecrated by three Italian Bishops. The evils of the schism were felt in Africa, where Cyprian was Bishop. To counteract its bad effects, he wrote his tract—not to settle any question of the superiority of any one chair over all the rest: Cyprian knew nothing of that; "the Episcopate" he says "is one, and each Bishop so holds his part as to be interested in the whole:" *Episcopatus unus est, cujus a singulis in solidum pars tenetur*—but to assert the right of the duly consecrated Bishop of an individual Church. A right as clear, and as essential to the Catholic unity, in the least, as in the most important, diocese. According to what Jerome said (Letter to Evagrius, lxxxv) "wherever there is a Bishop whether at Rome, or at Eugubium, or at Constantinople, or at Rhegium, or at Alexandria, or at Thanis, his worth is the same, and his priesthood is the same. (*Ejusdem meriti, ejusdem et sacerdotii.*) Wealth elevates no Bishop by its influence, nor does poverty degrade any by its insignificance; but all are successors of the Apostles."

doth "call himself Universal Bishop," doth "forerun Antichrist." When Augustine came to England, the seven Welsh Bishops, whom he invited to a conference, replied, by Dunod, Abbot of Bangor, to his demand for their submission to the Pope, in these plain words: "Be it known, and without doubt, unto you, that we all are, and every one of us, obedient and subject to the Church of God, and to the Pope of Rome, and every godly Christian, to love every one in his degree, to perfect charity, and to help every one of them, by word and deed to be the children of God: and other obedience than this I do not know due to him whom you name Pope, nor to be the Father of Fathers, to be claimed and to be demanded. And this obedience we are ready to give, and to pay to him, and to every Christian continually. Besides, we are under the government of the Bishop of Kaerlion upon Uske; who is to oversee under God over us, to cause us to keep the way spiritual." When the Portuguese arrived in Malabar, three centuries ago, and claimed the Syrian Churches, with their Bishops, for the Pope: "Who is the Pope?"—the natives asked—"we never heard of him." The Church has got along without the Pope before, as well as since, the reformation; and can do so very well. When the Rock Christ Jesus fails her, she will find poor resting on the Rock, which sometimes found itself in Avignon, and sometimes at Rome. The special pleading which ensues, by way of showing how free from harm that is which God is said to have ordained, is hardly worthy of a loyal Papist. "That the Vicar of Jesus Christ *is* powerless against the truth," is just the case in point. It is the truth that tramples the tiara down. As to his power being for edification, not "for destruction," it depends exactly on how much he has. All history is bloody with the traces of his iron hand. The Inquisition is not yet forgotten. Miserable Ireland, laid open to us in the London Quarterly Review, attests the unchangeableness of Rome, in tyranny, as in false doctrine.

As to any assumption by the Pope, at this day, of any political power over Catholics residing out of the Roman States, it is idle to think of it; and if the history of the middle ages present examples of this character, modern writers of celebrity have not been wanting to trace them to the peculiar state of society at that time, and to a principle eminently republican, namely, that power is a trust, which, if abused, reverts to the people. If facts of history be dispassionately considered, the Pontiff will appear to have been the organ of the people, in circumstances when they durst not speak: their shield, when they could oppose no resistance: their avenger, when they should otherwise have been trampled under foot with impunity. At all events, it is wrong to make facts of this kind a ground for refusing to admit the authority of the Pontiff in the government of the Church, which is alone required as a condition for communion. To call for disclaimers is not rightly to estimate the majesty and dignity of the Catholic Church: to wish to fix with precision the limits of a power which must be great to meet all the exigencies of the Church, in the numberless vicissitudes of ages, is to create unnecessary embarrassment. For every sincere friend of union it should suffice, that the authority is conservative and paternal, confessedly limited by the divine law, and only to be exercised for the spiritual interests of the Christian commonwealth.—pp. 12, 13.

And pray, had Bishop Kenrick, when he qualified the supposition of assumption by the Pope, by the pregnant phrase, "at this day," forgotten that chief lesson of his Master, the unchangeableness of Rome—*semper eadem?* For that his Master will correct him. We, meanwhile, are not deceived by it. We have before now read the oath required of Bishops, at their consecration, by the usage of the Church of Rome. A portion of it may refresh the Bishop of Arath's memory, and prevent his going too far in flattering republicans. "The middle ages," quotha! As if infallibility were not immutable.

"I, M., elected to the Church of M., will from this time henceforth, be *faithful and obedient to the blessed Apostle Peter*, and to the holy Roman Church,

and to our lord N. Pope N. and to his canonical successors. * * * * Saving my order, I will assist in retaining and defending the Roman Papacy, and *the royalties* of St. Peter (Regalia Sancti Petri,) *against every one.* * * * * I will take care to preserve, defend, increase, and advance the rights, honours, privileges and authority of the holy Roman Church, of our Lord the Pope, and his aforesaid successors. * * * * *To the utmost of my power, I will* PERSECUTE AND ATTACK *the heretics, schismatics and rebels against the same our Lord, and his aforesaid successors.*"[1]

Small inducement, indeed, to increase his power, who has so pledged its "utmost!" Poor encouragement, indeed, to look to Hildebrand, and those who only need his strength to be as Hildebrand, to be "the organ of the people!" But "the facts of history" must "be dispassionately considered;" read, that is, with a confessor to interpret. "*At all events*, it is wrong to make facts *of this kind*" (what kind?) "a ground for refusing to admit the authority of the Pontiff in the government of the Church, which is ALONE required as *a condition for communion!*" Get us so far, and the rest will come of course! "To call for DISCLAIMERS! is not rightly to estimate the majesty and dignity of the [Roman] Catholic Church!" "To wish *to fix with precision the limits of* A POWER WHICH MUST BE GREAT, to meet all the exigencies of the Church, in the numberless vicissitudes of ages, is *to create unnecessary embarrassment!*" No doubt, all limits set to power are awkward and embarrasing to tyrants. Hence, Napoleon's summary disposal of the subject—"the state it is myself!" "For every *sincere friend of union* it should suffice, that the authority is conservative and paternal, confessedly limited by the divine law"—"as I interpret it"—"and only to be exercised for the spiritual interests of the Christian commonwealth." Thank you kindly, Sir, for your deep interest in

---

[1] Perceval on the Roman Schism, xxxviii—xl.

"the Christian commonwealth." It gets on very well without an earthly head. The history of the old Church admonishes us to be content with the Lord our God, for our king. We have not the slightest inclination to put our trust in the shadow of the bramble.

Bishops are sometimes flattered by the enemies of the Papacy, which is represented as hostile to the free exercise of their rightful prerogatives. When Dupin devised the union of Anglicans and Gallicans, though he professed his intention to seek the sanction of the Pope, when the articles of union should be agreed on, he avoided shocking the sensibilities of Archbishop Wake, whose pride he felt, would revolt at the bare mention of an authority superior to that of his Grace of Canterbury. Yet who does not know, that Augustin, acting under the direction of Gregory the Great, had more real authority throughout Britain than any modern occupant of his See lays claim to? The admission of the pontifical power secures the freedom of the prelacy from the unjust local restraints, which the civil power oftentimes is disposed to impose, and strengthens every just exercise of episcopal authority. A Catholic Bishop is no wise fettered in the exercise of his rightful prerogatives by the consideration that he is responsible for their abuse to a distant superior. It is the wise dispensation of Providence, that submission to superior authority should be the guarantee of every subaltern power, and that independence, assumed in violation of the divine constitution of the Church, should be punished by the forfeiture of all that is valuable in government. The prelate who refuses obedience to the Pope, becomes the crouching slave of a monarch; and the Priest who discards the protecting authority of his Bishop, is forced to fawn on laymen.—p. 13.

I have no notion that any of my brethren will need me to speak for them, in reply to the insinuations of this paragraph. And yet, I will say, that if any portion of this letter could be grateful to them, it would not be that. They desire nothing, as their "rightful prerogative," which is not given them by the word of God, as understood and acted on in the first ages of the Church: and, in maintaining that, they find no trouble with the people of their charge; and

need no aid but His, who called them to be shepherds of the flock, for which He shed His blood. They are as little capable of being "flattered" by the servants, as "by the enemies, of the Papacy." They are as little governed, as you unworthily suspect "Archbishop Wake" to have been, by any "pride," in spurning from them an "authority superior," to them, to whom Christ himself hath said, "As my Father sent me, even so send I you." Against "unjust local restraints," should they ever be called to suffer from them from "the civil power," of which they entertain no apprehension; or in aid of "the just exercise of Episcopal authority," they ask no protection from the Pope,and no counsel from his vassals. They admit not that the power they hold is a "subaltern power,"[1] except, as it bends humbly at the throne of Him who put them into this, His ministry; and they bless God, that they are free from all considerations of responsibility to any "superior," "distant," or near at hand. Admonished by our divine and gracious Lord, we "call no man Master;" for "one is" our "Master, even Christ." From Him, our office comes. In his name, it is exercised. To his glory, it is devoted. The souls we seek to save were purchased by His blood. The virtue of our ministry comes through the power of His prevailing Spirit. With Peter—whose true heart, if it could suffer, in the Paradise of God, the blasphemies of Rome would daily wring to agony—we exhort one another, as fellow elders, and fellow witnesses for the sufferings of Christ, and fellow-partakers, as we humbly hope, of the glory that shall be revealed; "Feed the flock of God which is among you, taking the oversight thereof not by constraint, but willingly; not

---

[1] How strenuously the Papacy endeavours to degrade Episcopacy is well shown in the discussions at Trent. The divine right of Bishops is the Pope's worst hindrance.

for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind; neither as being lords over God's heritage, but being ensamples to the flock; and when THE CHIEF SHEPHERD shall appear, ye shall receive a crown of glory that fadeth not away."

That there are other serious difficulties in the way of union cannot be dissembled. To treat of them on this occasion, might be premature. Not only are errors to be renounced, and a governing authority to be recognized, but personal interests and claims are at stake. For the present I shall only say, that the object to be attained merits the greatest sacrifices, and that the Father of the faithful would, no doubt, extend the indulgence of the Church to the utmost limits consistent with principle, and with the general interests of religion. For myself and my colleagues I can safely say, without having had any communication with them on this subject, that nothing shall be wanting on our part to faciliate this reconciliation. In these circumstances, can we despair of seeing it accomplished? Will you hesitate to concur to so glorious a work? Will you refuse to apply the necessary remedies to heal the breach of the daughter of God's people? Shall our hopes be disappointed, and shall we be left to repeat the lamentations of the prophet: "We looked for peace, and no good came: for a time of healing, and behold fear. . . . . For the affliction of the daughter of my people I am afflicted, and made sorrowful, astonishment hath taken hold on me. Is there no balm in Gilead, or is there no physician there? Why then is not the wound of the daughter of my people closed?"—p. 13.

It is as poor a proof of self-respect, as of the estimation in which we are held by him, that Bishop Kenrick speaks of "*other serious difficulties* in the way of union," which it were "premature" "to treat," "on this occasion," besides the doctrinal concessions and ecclesiastical admissions, which he calls on us to make. When he has brought us to renounce the faith of Cranmer, Cyprian, Ignatius, Paul, "the faith once delivered to the saints," and embrace the gross corruptions which were mingled in the festering and fermenting caldron mixed and stirred at Trent, and to recognize the Bishop of

Rome as "the true Vicar of Christ, and head of the whole Church, and the father and teacher of all Christians," the "personal interests and claims," which "are at stake," will not detain us long. God forbid that we should glory! But, before that time comes, God grant that these, our bodies, may be "given to be burned!" In the mean time, permit me simply to inquire, by what right you, or any of, or even all, your colleagues, make these overtures to us? Who authorised you to answer for "the Father of the faithful?" Who made the servant free to give the invitations of his Master's house? Nay: by what right do you, the inferior and vassal of the Pope, approach us, Bishops of the Catholic Church of Christ; and so—saving the reverence due to occupancy of the see in which Apostles laboured, preached and died—the equals of the Bishop of Rome; and, therefore, your superiors? We are no Vicars of the Apostolic See, as you are; but Vicars[1] of the Lord of heaven and earth. We claim no personal regard, but humbly wash your feet, as well becomes us. But if you touch our office, if you trench upon our trust, which we

---

[1] This was the title anciently, and, indeed, down to the ninth century, given to all Bishops; as it well describes the nature of their mission—"*as* my Father sent me, *even so* send I you." There is no need of authorities. They will be found referred to in Bingham's Christian Antiquities, Book II. chap. ii. sect. 10. One place from Cyprian may be given, for all. "For, hence alone have heresies arisen, and schisms sprung into being, that men do not submit themselves to the priest of God, nor consider that there should be one Bishop only in a Church at once, and one Judge (*vice Christi*) the Vicar of Christ." *Letter to Cornelius*, lv.—The policy of Rome is shrewdly hinted at in an article in the British Critic, (xxviii, 514) a part of which I cite, as kindred with the text.

"Now, though most Englishmen might smile at such an idea, Rome looks deeper into history, and knows very well, that a danger which has once been, still is. She therefore discountenances every thing which tends to the idea of a self-succession of Bishops, and inherent local rights in the English Church. She wishes still to govern England, as indeed, she wishes to govern all the world, with Vicars Apostolic. In like manner, as she gives her agents titles without sees, so would she give them all, if possible, sees without titles."

received from Christ, and hold for Him and Him alone, we plainly say to you, that, if the Bishop of Rome, our fellow-bishop, be your superior, you may choose what name or place you will, but Bishops, in the Catholic sense, as we are, we allow you not to be.

An impulse, Right Reverend Sirs, has been given to the religious mind which you will find it impossible to check, and difficult to resist, and if you pass not speedily with your adherents to the camp of Catholicity, there is every appearance that numbers may break from your ranks, and, without you, rally under its glorious banner. The will of our heart, and our petition to God, is for you untó salvation, and we count as dross every worldly advantage, to gain to to the Church of Christ your souls, and the numbers whose eternal destinies are bound up with yours. In the sincerity of our souls we have wished to be anathema from Christ for your sakes: and we are ready to advance to the utmost limits to which the divine law allows us, in order to facilitate your return, that we may embrace you with all the warmth of fraternal affection. We feel that we ought to be bound together by cords of love in holy unity; but it is not permitted us to go beyond the precincts of the Church to reach you in your present position; and therefore from afar we raise our voice, and with all the earnestness and affection of brothers, we exhort and conjure you to come to us, that we may impart unto you some spiritual grace to strengthen you, that is to say, that we may be comforted together in you, by that which will then be common to us all, your faith and ours. "Cum unanimitas et concordia nostra scindi omnino non debeat, quia nos, Ecclesia derelicta, foras exire, et ad vos venire non possumus, ut vos magis ad Ecclesiam matrem, et ad nostram fraternitatem revertamini, quibus possumus hortamentis petimus et rogamus."—pp. 14, 15.

---

[1] Lest any one, who has not looked at Cyprian, should think that all this Latin must prove something; it is well to remark that the quotation has nothing to do with the subject. Cyprian, an African Bishop, is writing to Maximus, a presbyter, and to Nicostratus, a deacon, of the Church of Rome, who, forsaking their true Bishop Cornelius, had joined the party of the schismatical Bishop, Novatian. He tells them of his former love for them, and of the grief it gave them, that against Church order, against Gospel law, against Catholic unity,

God forbid, that the "impulse" given in these last few years to the "religious mind" should be resisted! Far be it from us to strive to check it! It is an impulse from on high. It bears us towards the source of truth. And it will carry with it, to save or to destroy, whatever, in opposing it, resists the truth. Under "its glorious banner," multitudes are rallying, more will rally. It is the banner of THE CROSS, and, when it beams on faithful hearts, the very waving of its folds is victory. Not for a moment, from its lofty and triumphant march, will men be turned aside, by the poor grudgings of the Puritan, called by whatever name, or by the specious flatteries of Papists. "The camp of Catholicity," so called, at Arath, lies not in its path; or, if it does, but to be swept away at its approach, as the retiring wave swept Pharaoh and his host. Even now the Lord takes off their chariot wheels, that they go heavily. Even now they grudge and murmur that the host increases not among us, as they would.[1] And such an artifice, employed at such a time, betokens men "at their wits' end," and so perplexed as to forget not only courtesy but policy. A flimsier, thinner subterfuge was never used. A child sees through it. And, if "the Father of the faithful" does not call the writer home from Arath, and reprove

---

they had consented to the consecration of a second Bishop in a diocese—in other words, the setting up of another Church. And, in conclusion, he exhorts them, since it is impossible for him and his to leave the Church, and go to them, that they would return to their mother Church, and to the brotherhood which they had forsaken. Such are the occasion and the substance of the letter (xlv.) which is very short. If a presbyter and a deacon of the diocese of Pennsylvania, were to leave the communion of the Bishop, and go to the schismatist of Arath, the Bishop of North Carolina might address them in just such terms. Let the reader judge of its appropriate use on this occasion.

[1] "Were it not for the immigration into this country, the Catholic [?] religion would long since have been extinct; at least, it would not have increased its numbers. The principal cause of THIS MELANCHOLY TRUTH is," &c.—*Catholic Herald*, Feb. 25, 1841.

him, his right hand forgets its cunning. Were a deacon of this diocese to perpetrate so gross a blunder, he should feel the fullest force of my rebuke. I would tell him that the occasion he had taken was unworthy of a generous heart. I would tell him that the spirit which pervaded every line was the spirit of a partisan, and not the spirit of a Catholic Churchman. I would tell him that while I blushed for the unskilfulness of the piece, unworthy of the coutrivance even of a school boy, I was shocked at the impiety which could so mix up unworthiness of motive and unfairness of occasion with the professions of peace and the phrases of piety. I would tell him, in a word, that "the wisdom that is from above, is first pure, then peaceable, gentle, and easy to be entreated, full of mercy and good fruits, without partiality, and without hypocricy."

Come to us, then, brethren, and be engrafted in the vine, that you may bear fruit unto everlasting life. It aflicts us deeply to see you still separated from the Church, by reason of the unhappy revolt of your ancestors from the authority of Peter. Look up, we entreat you, to that chair, which amid the wreck of empires remains in its sublime elevation. Dynasties have passed away, and even within our days the occupants of thrones have changed, like the actors on a stage; whilst the successor of the fisherman continues to sit in the chair of unity, repeating, without regard to the prevailing prejudices of the day, the unchangeable maxims of Religion, and presenting the lasting miracle of a power, serene and secure amidst the storms of a convulsed world, and baffling, by its clear and deep tones, the efforts of Hell to drown divine truth in the discordant sounds of erring teachers. Gregory XVI. invites you to return to the Church with the same authority and affection wherewith the first Gregory called your ancestors to her communion.

Dolor est cum vos videmus ita præcisos jacere,
Numerate sacerdotes vel ab ipsa Petri sede,
Et in ordine illo patrum quis cui successit videte:
Ipsa est petra, quam non vincunt superbæ inferorum portæ.

With sincere affection in Christ, and great personal consideration, I have the honour to remain, Right Reverend Sirs,

Your obedient servant,

FRANCIS PATRICK KENRICK,
Bishop of Arath, and Coadj. of Bishop of Phila.

PHILADELPHIA.
Feast of St. John at the Latin Gate, 1841.

Of these mere words, but little need be said. We are in small danger of mistaking, for THE TRUE AND LIVING VINE, the parasite, that clings about it, to blight its clusters, and, were it not divine, to kill its root. Nor need we waste a line to show that "the unhappy revolt of" "our ancestors from the authority of Peter," is any thing that Bishop Kenrick chooses, but a fact. We appeal to history for the particulars of what is well stated in his sermon, "Hear the Church," by Dr. Hook.

"So regularly, so canonically, was the Reformation conducted, that even those who thought no reformation requisite still remained for a time in the Church; they did not consider what was done (though they did not approve of it) sufficient to drive them into schism. It was not till the 12th year of Queen Elizabeth's reign, that listening to the exhortations of the Pope, they quitted the Church and formed a new sect; from which the present Roman dissenters have descended, and in which were retained all those errors in opinion and practice, all that rubbish which the Catholic Church in England had by the Reformation corrected and swept away. Let it always be remembered that the English Romanists separated from us, not we from them; we did not go out from them, but they from us. The slightest acquaintance with that neglected branch of learning, ecclesiastical history, will convince us of this. They left the Church of England, to which they originally belonged, because they thought their Bishops had reformed too much, had become too Protestant: just as Protestant dissenters left us, because they thought we had not reformed enough; that we were, as they still style us, too Popish. The one party left us because they wanted no reform; the other because, instead of a reformation, they wished a religious revolution: the Reformers of the Church of England carefully pre-

served the middle path. The Church of England, then, that Church to which we belong, is the old Catholic Church, which was originally planted in this country."

For the chair of Rome, occupied once by an Apostle; for the Church of Rome, where apostles preached and died, and to which Paul addressed a letter, which is now to us the word of God; we entertain, as such, a holy reverence. It is Papal Rome, not Apostolic Rome, from which we shrink, as from a body spotted with the plague; or, but approach her, should God give the opportunity, and then cheerfully, if at our lives' cost, to purify and heal. The chair of Peter, as the chair of John, or Titus, we may well regard with wonder and adoring awe, as the expressive emblem of that divine Episcopacy which has survived, through generation after generation, and will survive the world, which it was sent to bless and save, through faith which is in Christ. But speak not of the Pope of Rome, as sitting in "the chair of unity." Speak not of Rome as one. Rome is not one. And the approach to oneness that is in her is the oneness of compulsion and constraint; the unity of mere indifference, the dull, dead level of infidelity. Rome never yet agreed, to specify no more, as to the resting place of that infallibility, on which alone her claim to unity reposes; nor does she yet agree. Well has Mr. Newman said—would that he would add to all his other service to the Church a work, well worthy of his talents and his learning, THE VARIATIONS OF POPERY!—"the theologians of Romanism have been able dexterously to smoothe over a thousand inconsistencies, and to array the heterogeneous precedents of a course of centuries, in the semblance of design and harmony. But they cannot complete their system in its most important and essential point. They can determine in theory the nature, degree, extent, and object of the infallibility which they claim; they cannot agree among themselves where it resides. As in the building of Babel, the Lord hath

confounded their language; and the structure stands half-finished, a monument at once of human daring and its failure."[1]

The Bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church, addressed by Bishop Kenrick, must doubtless deem it highly complimentary to them, that, in selecting from the works of St. Augustin, a concluding extract, to enforce his argument, one should be taken from his Hymn against the Donatists: "composed," as we are needlessly informed by the historian Dupin, "*in vulgar and popular terms, to teach the most unlearned* the state of the question betwixt the Catholics" (not Romanists) "and the Donatists, and to exhort these to a re-union with the Catholics—a writing, as Augustin himself observes, "*proper for none but very ordinary people.*" Such as it is, there is no candidate for orders, much less any deacon in all our dioceses, who will not see at once, that, whether as to the occasion of the writing, or the meaning of the lines extracted, they have no bearing on the subject. Between the Donatists and the communion, favoured, through their Bishops, with this letter, there is not even the agreement of Macedonia with Monmouth, that there are "rivers in both:" and the appeal of the quotation starts, not from the chair of Peter strictly, but from the unbroken line of Bishops in the Catholic Church, from which they had gone out, beginning from that chair. "Enumerate the Bishops even from Peter's chair, and in that line of fathers mark the due succession: that is the Rock[2] against which even the gates of hell shall not prevail." A question this, in whose discussion it might not suit the Bishop of Arath and his colleagues to engage; since it might prove them, in the expressive phrase of

---

[1] Romanism and Popular Protestantism, p. 150.

[2] It is worthy of note, that the Trent doctors, at their third session, set forth as *the only foundation of the Church*, against which the gates of hell shall not prevail," *not* Peter, but *the confession of a true faith:* in so many words, THE NICENE CREED.

their own Champney, but "probable Bishops," after all. The Council of Nice decrees (Canon IV.) "It is most fitting that a Bishop be appointed by all the Bishops in the province. But if this be difficult, by reason of any urgent necessity, or through the length of the way, three must by all means meet together." It was decreed by the Synods of Arles, Nice, Antioch, Laodicea, Carthage, Orange, that at least three Bishops should consecrate. Now, Dr. John Carroll, the first titular Bishop of Baltimore, was consecrated by Dr. Walmsley, alone; and it is believed, with good reason, that Dr. Walmsley himself was consecrated by but one Bishop. "Now an ordination," says one of their chief writers, "which is merely probable, or only probably sufficient and valid, only makes *a probable Bishop*, or one who is merely probably a Bishop. * * * * But he who is only probably a Bishop, is not validly and sufficiently appointed to the Episcopal degree and power; nor has he Episcopal vocation; for true and valid Episcopal vocation is not merely probable, but certain and undoubted. * * * But otherwise, whatever the Pastors and Bishops of the Church should perform, as Bishops, would be so uncertain as to be probably null and invalid."[1] This is mentioned only for the benefit of "whom it may concern:" it being observable that one looks in vain to "the Metropolitan Catholic Almanac and Laity's Directory," for any details of the succession—"quis cui successit"—of these "probable Bishops."

"Gregory XVI. invites you to return to the Church with the same authority and affection wherewith the first Gregory called your ancestors to the Communion."—To any proper communication which the Bishop of Rome shall ever make to the Bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America, his office and their own will be a certain guaranty of due reception and

---

[1] Champnæus, de Vocatione Ministrorum, 424.

respectful answer. To such an invitation as the Bishop of Arath undertakes to make for him, we reply not at all. We respect our order, we revere the Catholic doctrine, we reverence the word of God, too much. We place ourselves, at once, upon the ground of Ephesus,[1] and utterly repudiate an interference so insulting. We are freemen, born free. We cherish, as a sacred trust, for those that shall come after us, "that liberty, wherewith our Lord Jesus Christ, the Deliverer of all men, has endowed us by his own blood." We are Bishops of the Church of God; and recognising no higher office in the Church, save His, who is the "Shepherd and the Bishop of our souls," we "give place" to the Bishop of Rome, "by subjection, no, not for an hour." When he calls home from among our flocks his vagrant Apostolic Vicars; when he addresses us, as brethren, put in trust, in the same Church, with the same Gospel; when he proposes to confer with us, touching the points in which we differ, with the reference of all of them to Holy Scripture, interpreted by Catholic antiquity, as represented in the first four General Councils; when he retracts his awful curses; and, "forbearing threatening," gives a brother's hand to brothers; kneeling with us at the one altar, where the Body and the Blood, that bought us all from everlasting death, are freely offered to whoever will receive them, in true penitence and faith, as pledges of salvation: then shall the hand of brethren grasp, with living love, a brother's hand; then shall the hearts of brethren burn and melt within them, with adoring gratitude; then shall Ephraim no more envy Judah, and Judah shall no more vex Ephraim; then shall the past be all forgotten; and the only struggle for the future, who shall love each other and all men the most, and so best serve the gracious Lover of us all; then shall the sorest hindrance to the progress of the

[1] See page 191.

kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ be taken away; and then, to His own Banner of the Cross, borne forward by a nobler host than ever gathered yet beneath its flaming folds, "God, even our own God," shall graciously vouchsafe the victory. "Hasten it, Lord, in thine own time." "Even so, come, Lord Jesus, come quickly!"

O Lord, who hast taught us that all our doings without charity are nothing worth; send thy Holy Ghost, and pour into our hearts that most excellent gift of charity, the very bond of peace, and of all virtues; without which, whosoever liveth, is counted dead before thee: Grant this for thine only Son Jesus Christ's sake. *Amen.*

O Almighty God, who hast built thy Church upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the head corner-stone; grant us to be joined together in unity of spirit by their doctrine, that we may be made an holy temple acceptable unto thee, through Jesus Christ our Lord. *Amen.*

ERRATA.

Page 190, line 19, for "Philadelphia," read *Pennsylvania.*

Page 192, line 14, for "querentis," read *querentes.*

280.31K
D65B
Cop. 2
Doane, G.
A brief examination of the proofs
97836
NOV 25 '58 JF SALMON
MAR 24 '59
DEC 30 '63 SALMON
JAN 7 '64

280.31K
D65B
Cop 2
97836